



# भारत का राजपत्र The Gazette of India

प्राधिकार से प्रकाशित  
PUBLISHED BY AUTHORITY

साप्ताहिक  
WEEKLY

सं. 6] नई दिल्ली, फरवरी 3—फरवरी 9, 2008, शनिवार/माघ 14—माघ 20, 1929  
No. 6] NEW DELHI, FEBRUARY 3—FEBRUARY 9, 2008, SATURDAY/MAGHA 14—MAGHA 20, 1929

इस भाग में भिन्न पृष्ठ संख्या दी जाती है जिससे कि यह पृथक संकलन के रूप में रखा जा सके  
Separate Paging is given to this Part in order that it may be filed as a separate compilation

भाग II—खण्ड 3—उप-खण्ड (ii)  
PART II—Section 3—Sub-section (ii)

भारत सरकार के मंत्रालयों (रक्षा मंत्रालय को छोड़कर) द्वारा जारी किए गए सांविधिक आदेश और अधिसूचनाएं  
Statutory Orders and Notifications Issued by the Ministries of the Government of India  
(Other than the Ministry of Defence)

## गृह मंत्रालय

नई दिल्ली, 31 जनवरी, 2008

का. आ. 237.—केन्द्र सरकार राजभाषा (संघ के शासकीय प्रयोजनों के लिए प्रयोग) नियम, 1976 के नियम 10 के उप नियम (4) के अनुसरण में गृह मंत्रालय के निम्नलिखित कार्यालयों में हिन्दी का कार्यसाधक ज्ञान रखने वाले कर्मचारियों की संख्या 80% से अधिक हो जाने के फलस्वरूप उन्हें एतद्द्वारा अधिसूचित करती है।

### केन्द्रीय रिजर्व पुलिस बल :

1. कार्यालय कामांडेंट-150 बटालियन, केरिपुबल।
2. कार्यालय कामांडेंट-156 बटालियन, केरिपुबल।
3. कार्यालय कामांडेंट-157 बटालियन, केरिपुबल।
4. कार्यालय कामांडेंट-158 बटालियन, केरिपुबल।
5. कार्यालय कामांडेंट-167 बटालियन, केरिपुबल।
6. कार्यालय कामांडेंट-176 बटालियन, केरिपुबल।
7. कार्यालय पुलिस उप महानिरीक्षक, केरिपुबल, रंगारेड्डी
8. कार्यालय कामांडेंट-141 बटालियन, केरिपुबल।
9. कार्यालय कामांडेंट-142 बटालियन, केरिपुबल।

10. कार्यालय कामांडेंट-154 बटालियन, केरिपुबल।
11. कार्यालय कामांडेंट-186 बटालियन, केरिपुबल।
12. कार्यालय कामांडेंट-187 बटालियन, केरिपुबल।
13. कार्यालय कामांडेंट-188 बटालियन, केरिपुबल।
14. कार्यालय कामांडेंट-189 बटालियन, केरिपुबल।
15. कार्यालय कामांडेंट-190 बटालियन, केरिपुबल।
16. कार्यालय पुलिस महानिरीक्षक, त्रिपुरा सेक्टर, केरिपुबल अगरतला।
17. कार्यालय पुलिस उप महानिरीक्षक, केरिपुबल, अगरतला।
18. कार्यालय अपर पुलिस उप महानिरीक्षक, ग्रुप केन्द्र, केरिपुबल, अगरतला।
19. कार्यालय कामांडेंट-186 बटालियन, केरिपुबल।
20. कार्यालय कामांडेंट-187 बटालियन, केरिपुबल।
21. कार्यालय कामांडेंट-188 बटालियन, केरिपुबल।
22. कार्यालय कामांडेंट-189 बटालियन, केरिपुबल।
23. कार्यालय कामांडेंट-190 बटालियन, केरिपुबल।

**केन्द्रीय औद्योगिक सुरक्षा बल :**

1. के औ सु ब इकाई, आई जी आई एयरपोर्ट, नई दिल्ली
2. के औ सु ब इकाई, सिविल एयरपोर्ट, चण्डीगढ़
3. के औ सु ब इकाई, सी. एस. अन्तर्राष्ट्रीय एयरपोर्ट, मुम्बई (महाराष्ट्र)
4. के औ सु ब इकाई, ग्वालियर एयरपोर्ट, ग्वालियर (मध्यप्रदेश) ।
5. के औ सु ब इकाई, डी ए बी एच एयरपोर्ट, इन्दौर (मध्य प्रदेश) ।
6. के औ सु ब इकाई, राजासांसी एयरपोर्ट, अमृतसर (पंजाब) ।
7. के औ सु ब इकाई, कोचीन एयरपोर्ट, कोचीन (केरल) ।
8. के औ सु ब इकाई, कालीकट एयरपोर्ट, कालीकट (केरल) ।
9. के औ सु ब इकाई, शिमला एयरपोर्ट, शिमला (हिमाचल प्रदेश) ।

**सीमा सुरक्षा बल**

1. सी. सु. बल. संयुक्त अस्पताल, टेकनपुर, ग्वालियर (म.प्र.)
2. 55 बटालियन, सीमा सुरक्षा बल
3. क्षेत्रीय मुख्यालय सीमा सुरक्षा बल, बांदीपुर
4. 132 बटालियन, सीमा सुरक्षा बल
5. क्षेत्रीय मुख्यालय सीमा सुरक्षा बल, उदयपुर (त्रिपुरा दक्षिण)

**भारत के महारजिस्ट्रार का कार्यालय**

जनगणना कार्य निदेशालय, उड़ीसा जनपथ यूनिट-IX,  
भुवनेश्वर-751 022

**सशस्त्र सीमा बल**

सशस्त्र सीमा बल अकादमी, श्रीनगर (गढ़वाल),  
उत्तराखण्ड

[सं. 12017/1/2004-हिन्दी]

अवधेश कुमार मिश्र, निदेशक (राजभाषा)

**MINISTRY OF HOME AFFAIRS**

New Delhi, the 31st January, 2008

**S.O. 237.**—In pursuance of sub rule (4) of Rule 10 of the Official Languages (Use for Official Purposes of the Union) Rules, 1976, the Central Government hereby notifies the following offices of the Ministry of Home Affairs where the percentage of Hindi knowing staff has gone above 80%:

- (1) Office of the Commandant-150 Battalion, Central Reserve Police Force.
- (2) Office of the Commandant-156 Battalion, Central Reserve Police Force.
- (3) Office of the Commandant-157 Battalion, Central Reserve Police Force.

- (4) Office of the Commandant-158 Battalion, Central Reserve Police Force.
- (5) Office of the Commandant-167 Battalion, Central Reserve Police Force.
- (6) Office of the Commandant-176 Battalion, Central Reserve Police Force.
- (7) Office of the DIGP, Central Reserve Police Force, Rangareddy.
- (8) Office of the Commandant-141 Battalion, Central Reserve Police Force.
- (9) Office of the Commandant-142 Battalion, Central Reserve Police Force.
- (10) Office of the Commandant-154 Battalion, Central Reserve Police Force.
- (11) Office of the Commandant-186 Battalion, Central Reserve Police Force.
- (12) Office of the Commandant-187 Battalion, Central Reserve Police Force.
- (13) Office of the Commandant-188 Battalion, Central Reserve Police Force.
- (14) Office of the Commandant-189 Battalion, Central Reserve Police Force.
- (15) Office of the Commandant-190 Battalion, Central Reserve Police Force.
- (16) Office of Inspector General of Police, Tripura Sector, Central Reserve Police Force, Agartala.
- (17) Office of Dy. Inspector General of Police, Central Reserve Police Force, Agartala.
- (18) Office of Addl. Dy. Inspector General of Police, G.C., Central Reserve Police Force, Agartala.
- (19) Office of the Commandant-186 Battalion, Central Reserve Police Force.
- (20) Office of the Commandant-187 Battalion, Central Reserve Police Force.
- (21) Office of the Commandant-188 Battalion, Central Reserve Police Force.
- (22) Office of the Commandant-189 Battalion, Central Reserve Police Force.
- (23) Office of the Commandant-190 Battalion, Central Reserve Police Force.

**CENTRAL INDUSTRIAL SECURITY FORCE**

1. Central Industrial Security Force Unit, IGI Airport, New Delhi.
2. Central Industrial Security Force Unit, Civil Airport, Chandigarh.
3. Central Industrial Security Force Unit, C S International Airport, Mumbai (Maharashtra).
4. Central Industrial Security Force Unit, Gwalior Airport, Gwalior (M.P.).

5. Central Industrial Security Force Unit, DABH Airport, Indore (M.P.)
6. Central Industrial Security Force Unit, Rajasansi Airport, Amritsar (Punjab)
7. Central Industrial Security Force Unit, Cochin Airport, Cochin (Kerala).
8. Central Industrial Security Force Unit, Calicut Airport, Calicut (Kerala).
9. Central Industrial Security Force Unit, Shimla Airport, Shimla (Himachal Pradesh).

**BORDER SECURITY FORCE**

1. BSF Composite Hospital, Tekanpur, Gwalior (MP).
2. 55 Bn., Border Security Force.
3. Sector Headquarter, Border Security Force, Bandipur.
4. 132 Bn., Border Security Force.
5. Sector Headquarter, Border Security Force, Udaipur (Tripura South).

**OFFICE OF THE REGISTRAR GENERAL, INDIA**

Directorate of Census Operations, Orissa  
Janpath Unit-IX, Bhubaneswar-751022.

S. S. B.

S.S.B. Academy, Srinagar (Garhwal),  
Uttarakhand.

[No. 12017/1/2004-Hindi]

AVADHESH KUMAR MISHRA, Director (OL)

वित्त मंत्रालय

(राजस्व विभाग)

(केन्द्रीय प्रत्यक्ष कर बोर्ड)

नई दिल्ली, 23 जनवरी, 2008

का. आ. 238.—सर्वसाधारण की जानकारी के लिए एतद्वारा यह अधिसूचित किया जाता है कि केन्द्र सरकार द्वारा आयकर नियमावली, 1962 (उक्त नियमावली) के नियम 5ग और 5घ के साथ पठित आयकर अधिनियम, 1961 (उक्त अधिनियम) की धारा 35 की उपधारा (1) के खंड (ii) के प्रयोजनार्थ 1-4-2004 से संगठन ए.एम.एम. मुरुगप्पा चेडिटियर रिसर्च सेंटर, चेन्नई को निम्नलिखित शर्तों के अधीन 'वैज्ञानिक अनुसंधान संघ' की श्रेणी में अनुमोदित किया गया है, अर्थात्:-

- (i) अनुमोदित 'वैज्ञानिक अनुसंधान संघ' का एकमात्र उद्देश्य वैज्ञानिक अनुसंधान को बढ़ावा देना होगा;
- (ii) अनुमोदित संगठन स्वयं वैज्ञानिक अनुसंधान कार्यकलाप करेगा;
- (iii) अनुमोदित संगठन बही-खाता रखेगा तथा उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 288 की उप-धारा (2) के स्पष्टीकरण में यथा परिभाषित किसी लेखाकार से अपनी खाता-बही की लेखा परीक्षा कराएगा और उक्त

अधिनियम की धारा 139 की उप-धारा (1) के अंतर्गत आय विवरणी प्रस्तुत करने की नियत तिथि तक ऐसे लेखाकार द्वारा विधिवत सत्यापित एवं हस्ताक्षरित लेखा परीक्षा रिपोर्ट मामले में क्षेत्राधिकार रखने वाले आयकर आयुक्त अथवा आयकर निदेशक को प्रस्तुत करेगा ;

- (iv) अनुमोदित संगठन वैज्ञानिक अनुसंधान के लिए प्राप्त दान तथा प्रयुक्त राशि का अलग विवरण रखेगा और उपर्युक्त लेखा परीक्षा रिपोर्ट के साथ लेखा परीक्षक द्वारा विधिवत सत्यापित विवरण की प्रति प्रस्तुत करेगा ।

2. केन्द्र सरकार यह अनुमोदन वापिस ले लेगी यदि अनुमोदित संगठन :-

- (क) पैराग्राफ 1 के उप-पैराग्राफ (iii) में उल्लिखित लेखा बही नहीं रखेगा; अथवा
- (ख) पैराग्राफ 1 के उप-पैराग्राफ (iii) में उल्लिखित अपनी लेखा परीक्षा रिपोर्ट प्रस्तुत नहीं करेगा ; अथवा
- (ग) पैराग्राफ 1 के उप-पैराग्राफ (iv) में उल्लिखित वैज्ञानिक अनुसंधान के लिए प्राप्त एवं प्रयुक्त दान का अपना विवरण प्रस्तुत नहीं करेगा; अथवा
- (घ) अपना अनुसंधान कार्य करना बंद कर देगा अथवा इसके अनुसंधान कार्य को जायज नहीं पाया जाएगा; अथवा
- (ङ) उक्त नियमावली के नियम 5ग और 5घ के साथ पठित उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 35 की उप-धारा (1) के खंड (ii) के प्रावधानों के अनुरूप नहीं होगा तथा उनका पालन नहीं करेगा ।

[अधिसूचना सं. 13/2008/फा. सं. 203/136/2007-आ.क.नि.-II]

सुरेन्द्र पाल, अवर सचिव

**MINISTRY OF FINANCE**

(Department of Revenue)

(CENTRAL BOARD OF DIRECT TAXES)

New Delhi, the 23rd January, 2008

S.O. 238.—It is hereby notified for general information that the organization Shri A.M.M. Murugappa Chettiar Research Centre, Chennai, has been approved by the Central Government for the purpose of clause (ii) of sub-section (1) of Section 35 of the Income-tax Act, 1961 (said Act), read with rules 5C and 5D of the Income-tax Rules, 1962 (said Rules) with effect from 1-4-2004 in the category of 'scientific research association' subject to the following conditions, namely:

- (i) The sole objective of the approved 'scientific research association' shall be to undertake scientific research;
- (ii) The approved organization shall carry on the scientific research activity by itself;

- (iii) The approved organization shall maintain books of accounts and get such books audited by an accountant as defined in the explanation to sub-section (2) of Section 288 of the said Act and furnish the report of such audit duly signed and verified by such accountant to the Commissioner of Income-tax or the Director of Income-tax having jurisdiction over the case, by the due date of furnishing the return of income under sub-section (1) of Section 139 of the said Act;
- (iv) The approved organization shall maintain a separate statement of donations received and amounts applied for scientific research and a copy of such statement duly certified by the auditor shall accompany the report of audit referred to above.

2. The Central Government shall withdraw the approval if the approved organization :—

- (a) fails to maintain books of accounts referred to in sub-paragraph (iii) of paragraph 1; or
- (b) fails to furnish its audit report referred to in sub-paragraph (iii) of paragraph 1; or
- (c) fails to furnish its statement of donations received and amounts applied for scientific research referred to in sub-paragraph (iv) of paragraph 1; or
- (d) ceases to carry on its research activities or its research activities are not found to be genuine; or
- (e) ceases to conform to and comply with the provisions of clause (ii) of sub-section (1) of Section 35 of the said Act read with rules 5C and 5D of the said Rules.

[Notification No. 13/2008/F. No. 203/136/2007/ITA-II]

SURENDER PAL, Under Secy.

कार्यालय मुख्य आयकर आयुक्त

उदयपुर, 30 जनवरी, 2008

आयकर

(अधिसूचना संख्या-01/2007-08)

का.आ. 239.—आयकर अधिनियम, 1961 (1961 की 43वां) की धारा 10 के खण्ड (23ग) की उप-खण्ड (iv) के साथ पठित आयकर नियमावली, 1962 के नियम 2ग के द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए मुख्य आयकर आयुक्त, उदयपुर एतद्वारा “सोशल वर्क एण्ड रिसर्च सेंटर, तिलोनिया, अजमेर (राजस्थान)” को कर निर्धारण वर्ष 2006-07 से 2008-09 तक के लिए निम्नलिखित शर्तों के अधीन रहते हुए उक्त उप-खण्ड के प्रयोजनार्थ अधिसूचित करते हैं, अर्थात:-

- (i) कर निर्धारिती अपनी आय का इस्तेमाल अथवा अपनी आय का इस्तेमाल करने के लिए उनका संचयन पूर्णतया

तथा अनन्यतया उन उद्देश्यों के लिए करेगा जिनके लिए इसकी स्थापना की गई है;

- (ii) कर निर्धारिती उपर्युक्त कर निर्धारण वर्षों से संगत पूर्ववर्ती वर्षों की किसी भी अवधि के दौरान धारा 11 की उप-धारा (v) में विनिर्दिष्ट किसी एक अथवा एक से अधिक ढंग अथवा भिन्न तरीकों से अपनी निधि (जेवर, जवाहरात, फर्नीचर आदि के रूप प्राप्त तथा अनुरक्षित स्वैच्छिक अंशदान से भिन्न) का निवेश नहीं करेगा अथवा उसे जमा नहीं करेगा;
- (iii) यह अधिसूचना किसी ऐसी आय के सम्बन्ध में लागू नहीं होगी, जो कि कारोबार से प्राप्त लाभ तथा अभिलाभ हो जब तक कि ऐसा कारोबार उक्त कर निर्धारिती के उद्देश्यों की प्राप्ति के प्रासंगिक नहीं हो अथवा ऐसे कारोबार के सम्बन्ध में अलग से लेखा पुस्तिकाएँ नहीं रखी जाती हों;
- (iv) कर निर्धारिती आयकर अधिनियम 1961 के प्रावधानों के अनुसार अपनी आय विवरणी नियमित रूप से आयकर प्राधिकारी के समक्ष दाखिल करेगा;
- (v) विघटन की स्थिति में इसकी अतिरिक्त राशियाँ और परिसम्पत्तियाँ समान उद्देश्यों वाले धर्मार्थ संगठन को दे दी जायेगी;

यह अधिसूचना केवल संस्था की और से आय के प्राप्तकर्ता पर ही लागू होगी न कि इस तरह के प्राप्तकर्ता द्वारा किसी अन्य प्राप्ति अथवा आय पर। संस्था के आय की कराधयता अथवा अन्यथा पर, आयकर अधिनियम 1961 के उपबन्धों के अनुसार पृथक रूप से विचार किया जाएगा।

[संख्या मु.आ.आ./उदय/आ.अ.(तक.)/2007-08/2481]

मुकेश भान्ती, मुख्य आयकर आयुक्त

OFFICE OF THE CHIEF COMMISSIONER OF  
INCOME TAX

Udaipur, the 30th January, 2008

(INCOME TAX)

(No.01/2007-08)

S.O. 239.—In exercise of the powers conferred by Sub-Section (iv) of Clause (23C) of Section 10 of the Income-tax Act, 1961 (43 of 1961) read with rule 2C of the Income-tax Rules, 1962, I, Chief Commissioner of Income-tax, Udaipur hereby notify the “Social Work & Research Centre, Tilonia, Ajmer (Rajasthan)” for the purpose of the said sub-clause for the assessment years 2006-07 to 2008-09 subject to the following conditions, namely :—

- (i) The assessee will apply its income, or accumulate for application, wholly and exclusively to the objects for which it is established;
- (ii) The assessee will not invest or deposit its fund (other than voluntary contributions received

and maintained in the form of jewellery, furniture etc.) for any period during the previous year relevant to the assessment years mentioned above otherwise than in any one or more of the forms or modes specified in sub-section (5) of section 11;

- (iii) This notification will not apply in relation to any income being profits and gains of business, unless the business is incidental to the attainment of the objectives of the assessee and separate books of account are maintained in respect of such business;
- (iv) The assessee will regularly file its return of income before the Income-tax authority in accordance with the provisions of the Income Tax Act, 1961;
- (v) That in the event of dissolution, its surplus and the assets will be given to a charitable organization with similar objectives;

This notification is applicable only to the recipients of income on behalf of the assessee and not to any other receipt or income of such recipients. Taxability or, otherwise of the income of the assessee would be separately considered as per the provisions of the Income Tax Act, 1961.

[No. CCIT/UDR/ITO(Tech.)/2007-08/2481]

MUKESH BHANTI, Chief Commissioner of Income-tax

### विज्ञान और प्रौद्योगिकी विभाग

नई दिल्ली, 7 जनवरी, 2008

का.आ. 240.—श्री चित्रा तिरुनल आयुर्विज्ञान और प्रौद्योगिकी संस्थान, त्रिवेन्द्रम अधिनियम, 1980 (1980 की संख्या 52) की धारा 6 की उप-धारा (1) और (2) के साथ पठित धारा 5 के खंड जे के प्रावधानों के तहत श्री थेन्नाला जी बालकृष्ण पिल्लै, सदस्य राज्य सभा को दिनांक 22 नवम्बर, 2007 से उक्त संस्थान के सदस्य के रूप में विधिवत् निर्वाचित किया गया है।

स्थायी पता	दिल्ली का पता
अम्बाडी, यमुना नगर,	102, बहमपुरा
कराकुलम,	बी.डी. मार्ग,
डाकघर तिरुवनंतपुरम केरला।	नई दिल्ली-110001

2. निर्वाचित सदस्य के रूप में श्री थेन्नाला जी बालकृष्ण पिल्लै के कार्यालय की अवधि 21 अप्रैल, 2009 तक अथवा सदन की उनकी सदस्यता समाप्त होने तक, जो भी पहले हो, होगी।

3. श्री थेन्नाला जी. बालकृष्ण पिल्लै की सदस्यता श्री चित्रा तिरुनल आयुर्विज्ञान और प्रौद्योगिकी संस्थान, त्रिवेन्द्रम अधिनियम, 1980 के अन्य प्रावधानों को अध्यक्षीन होगी।

[सं. एआई/एस.सी.टी./009/2004/1999-वी आई पी]

नवनीत वर्मा, निदेशक

### DEPARTMENT OF SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY

New Delhi, the 7th January, 2008

S.O. 240.—In terms of the provisions of Clause J of Section-5 read with sub-Sections (1) and (2) of Section 6 of the Sree Chitra Tirunal Institute of Medical Sciences and Technology, Trivandrum Act, 1980 (No. 52 of 1980), Shri Thennala G. Balakrishna Pillai, Member, Rajya Sabha has been duly elected to be a member of the said Institute w.e.f. 22nd November, 2007.

Permanent Address	Delhi Address
Ambadi, Yamuna Nagar, Karakulam, P.O. Thiruvananthapuram, Kerala.	102, Brahmaputra, B.D. Marg, New Delhi-110001.

2. The term of Office of Shri Thennala G. Balakrishna Pillai as the elected member shall be upto 21st April, 2009 and the same shall come to an end as soon as he ceases to be a Member of the House, whichever is earlier.

3. The membership of Shri Thennala G. Balakrishna Pillai shall be subject to other provisions of Sree Chitra Tirunal Institute of Medical Sciences & Technology, Trivandrum Act, 1980.

[No. AI/SCT/009/2004/1999-VIP]

NAVNEET VERMA, Director

### संचार एवं सूचना प्रौद्योगिकी विभाग

( डाक विभाग )

( डाक जीवन बीमा निदेशालय )

नई दिल्ली, 14 जनवरी, 2008

का.आ. 241.—डाकघर बीमा निधि नियमावली के नियम 10 के तहत प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए और 31-3-2006 की स्थिति के अनुसार डाकघर जीवन बीमा निधि की परिसम्पत्तियों और देयताओं के बीमांकक मूल्यांकन के आधार पर महानिदेशक (डाक) सहर्ष 31-3-2006 को समाप्त होने वाले वर्ष के लिए डाकघर जीवन बीमा पालिसियों के मृत्यु अथवा परिपक्वता के कारण दावा बनने पर, उनके लिए निम्नलिखित दरों पर प्रत्यावर्तनीय बोनस घोषित करते हैं :-

क्रम बीमा पालिसी का सं. प्रकार	1000 रु. की बीमित राशि पर प्रतिवर्ष बोनस की दर
(I) आजीवन बीमा चालू पालिसी	बीमित राशि के प्रति हजार पर 90/- रु.
वर्ष के दौरान किया दावा	बीमित राशि के प्रति हजार पर 90/- रु. तथा साथ में 1000/- रु. तक की बीमित राशि पर 20/- रु. प्रति पालिसी की दर से टर्मिनल बोनस जो प्रति पालिसी पर अधिकतम 1000/- रु. के अध्यक्षीन होगा।

क्रम बीमा पालिसी का सं. प्रकार	1000/- की बीमित राशि पर प्रतिवर्ष बोनस की दर
(II) बंदोबस्ती बीमा चालू पालिसी	बीमित राशि के प्रति हजार पर 70/- रु.
वर्ष के दौरान किया दावा 20 वर्ष से कम अवधि वाली पालिसी	बीमित राशि के प्रति हजार पर 70/- रु.
20 वर्ष से अधिक अवधि वाली और 20 वर्ष के बराबर की पालिसी	बीमित राशि के प्रति हजार पर 70/- रु. तथा साथ में प्रत्येक 10,000/- रु. तक की बीमती राशि पर 20/- रु. प्रति पालिसी की दर से टर्मिनल बोनस जो प्रति पालिसी पर अधिकतम 1000/- रु. के अध्यक्षीन होगा।
(III) प्रत्याशित बंदोबस्ती बीमा	बीमित राशि के प्रति हजार पर 65/- रु.
(IV) परिवर्तनीय सावधि जमा	ऊपर बताई गई बीमा की संबंधित श्रेणी के लिए सम्बद्ध अवधियों हेतु बोनस आबंटित करने के लिए।

2. वर्ष 2005-06 के लिए बोनस की दरें, आपके सर्किल में इस अधिसूचना की प्राप्ति की तिथि से लागू होंगी और ये दावे के उन मामलों पर भी लागू होगी जो आपके सर्किल में प्राप्त हो चुके हैं परन्तु इस अधिसूचना की प्राप्ति की तिथि तक जिनका निपटान नहीं हुआ है।

3. भावी मूल्यांकन के पूरा होने तक परिपक्वता अथवा मृत्यु के कारण उत्पन्न सभी दावों के लिए भी उपर्युक्त दर पर अंतरिम बोनस देय होगा।

4. बोनस की राशि को 50 पैसे अथवा अधिक के भाग के लिए अगले उच्चतर रुपये में पूर्ण किया जाएगा और 50 पैसे से कम के भाग को हिसाब में नहीं लिया जाएगा।

[फा. सं. 4-2/2006-एल आई]

अचला भटनागर, महाप्रबंधक (संयुक्त सचिव)

**MINISTRY OF COMMUNICATION AND  
INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY**

(Department of Posts)

(Directorate of Postal Life Insurance)

New Delhi, the 14th January, 2008

**S.O. 241.**—In exercise of the powers conferred vide Rule 10 of Post Office Insurance Fund Rules and on the basis of Actuarial Valuation of the assets and liabilities of Post Office Life Insurance Fund as on 31-3-2006, the Director General (Posts) is pleased to declare a simple Reversionary Bonus for the year ending 31-3-2006 on the Postal Life Insurance Policies on their becoming claims, due to death

or maturity at the following rates :—

S. No	Type of Policy	Rate of Bonus P.A. for Rs.1000/- sum assured
I	WLA Continuing Policy	Rs.90/- per Thousand Rupees of Sum Assured
	Claims during the year	Rs.90/- per Thousand Rupees of Sum Assured+ Terminal Bonus of Rs.20/- for every Rs.10,000/- of Sum Assured subject to a maximum of Rs.1000/- per policy.
II	EA Continuing Policy	Rs.70/- per Thousand Rupees of Sum Assured
	Claims during the Year Policy Term < 20 Years	Rs. 70/- per Thousand Rupees of Sum Assured
	Policy Term > or = 20 Years	Rs. 70/- per thousand Rupees of Sum Assured+ Terminal Bonus of Rs. 20/- for every Rs. 10,000/- of sum Assured of subject to a maximum of Rs. 1000/- per policy.
III	AEA	Rs.65/- per Thousand Rupees of Sum Assured
IV	Convertible-Term Assurance.	To attract Bonus for the respective periods for the respective class of insurance as above.

2. The rates of Bonus for the year 2005-06 will be applicable from the date of receipt of this Notification by the Circles and this will also be applicable to claim cases received but not settled till the date of receipt of this Notification.

3 Interim Bonus at the rates mentioned above will also be payable for all claims arising due to maturity or death, until future valuation is completed.

4 The amount of Bonus involving a fraction of 50 paise or more shall be rounded off to the next higher Rupee and fraction below 50 paise shall be ignored.

[No. 4-2/2006-LI]

ACHLA BHATNAGAR, General Manager (Jt. Secy.)

उपभोक्ता मामले, खाद्य और सार्वजनिक वितरण मंत्रालय  
(उपभोक्ता मामले विभाग)

भारतीय मानक ब्यूरो

नई दिल्ली, 1 फरवरी, 2008

**का. आ. 242.**—भारतीय मानक ब्यूरो नियम, 1987 के नियम 7 के उप-नियम (1) के खंड (ख) के अनुसरण में भारतीय मानक ब्यूरो एतद्वारा अधिसूचित करता है कि जिन भारतीय मानकों के विवरण नीचे अनुसूची में दिए गए हैं वे स्थापित हो गए हैं :—

## अनुसूची

क्रम संख्या	स्थापित भारतीय मानक(कों) की संख्या वर्ष और शीर्षक	नये भारतीय मानक द्वारा अतिक्रमित भारतीय मानक अथवा मानकों, यदि कोई हो, की संख्या और वर्ष	स्थापित तिथि
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
1.	आईएस/आईएसओ 16163:2005 सतत तप्त-निमज्जन द्वारा लेपित इस्पात के शीट उत्पाद—आयामीय एवं आकार हेतु छूटें	—	30 नवम्बर, 2007

इस भारतीय मानक की प्रतियाँ भारतीय मानक ब्यूरो, मानक भवन, 9, बहादुरशाह जफर मार्ग, नई दिल्ली-110002, क्षेत्रीय कार्यालयों नई दिल्ली, कोलकाता, चण्डीगढ़, चेन्नई, मुम्बई तथा शाखा कार्यालयों अहमदाबाद, बंगलौर, भोपाल, भुवनेश्वर, कोयम्बतूर, गुवाहाटी, हैदराबाद, जयपुर, कानपुर, नागपुर, पटना, पुणे तथा तिरुवनन्तापुरम में बिक्री हेतु उपलब्ध हैं।

[संदर्भ : एमटीडी-4/टी-214]

डा. (श्रीमति) स्नेह भाटला, वैज्ञा. एफ एवं प्रमुख (एमटीडी)

## MINISTRY OF CONSUMER AFFAIRS, FOOD AND PUBLIC DISTRIBUTION

(Department of Consumer Affairs)

BUREAU OF INDIAN STANDARDS

New Delhi, the 1st February, 2008

S. O. 242.— In pursuance of clause (b) of sub-rule (1) of Rule 7 of the Bureau of Indian Standards Rules, 1987, the Bureau of Indian Standards hereby notifies that the Indian Standards, particulars of which are given in the Schedule hereto annexed have been established on the date indicated against each :

## SCHEDULE

Sl. No.	No. title and Year of the Indian Standards Established	No. and Year of the Indian Standards, if any, Superseded by the New Indian Standard	Date of Established
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
1	IS/ISO 16163:2005 Continuously, Hot-Dipped Coated Steel Sheet Products— Dimensional and Shape Tolerances.	—	30 November, 2007

Copy of this Standard is available for sale with the Bureau of Indian Standards, Manak Bhavan, 9, Bahadur Shah Zafar Marg, New Delhi-110002 and Regional Offices: New Delhi, Kolkata, Chandigarh, Chennai, Mumbai and also Branch Offices : Ahmedabad, Bangalore, Bhopal, Bhubaneswar, Coimbatore, Guwahati, Hyderabad, Jaipur, Kanpur, Nagpur, Patna, Pune, Thiruvananthapuram.

[Ref: MTD-4/T-214]

DR. (Mrs.) SNEH BHATLA, Sc.-F &amp; Head (Met Engg.)

नई दिल्ली, 1 फरवरी, 2008

का. आ. 243.— भारतीय मानक ब्यूरो नियम, 1987 के नियम 7 के उप-नियम (1) के खंड (ख) के अनुसरण में भारतीय मानक ब्यूरो एतद्द्वारा अधिसूचित करती है कि जिन भारतीय मानकों के विवरण नीचे अनुसूची में दिए गए हैं वे स्थापित हो गए हैं :-

## अनुसूची

क्रम संख्या	स्थापित भारतीय मानक(कों) की संख्या वर्ष और शीर्षक	नये भारतीय मानक द्वारा अतिक्रमित भारतीय मानक अथवा मानकों, यदि कोई हो, की संख्या और वर्ष	स्थापित तिथि
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
1.	आईएस/आईएसओ 16160:2005 सतत तप्त-बेल्लित इस्पात के शीट उत्पाद—आयामीय एवं आकार हेतु छूटें	—	30 नवम्बर, 2007

इस भारतीय मानक की प्रतियाँ भारतीय मानक ब्यूरो, मानक भवन, 9, बहादुरशाह जफर मार्ग, नई दिल्ली-110002, क्षेत्रीय कार्यालयों नई दिल्ली, कोलकाता, चण्डीगढ़, चेन्नई, मुम्बई तथा शाखा कार्यालयों अहमदाबाद, बंगलौर, भोपाल, भुवनेश्वर, कोयम्बतूर, गुवाहाटी, हैदराबाद, जयपुर, कानपुर, नागपुर, पटना, पुणे तथा तिरुवनन्तापुरम में बिक्री हेतु उपलब्ध हैं।

[संदर्भ : एमटीडी-4/टी-214]

डा. (श्रीमति) स्नेह भाटला, वैज्ञ. एफ एवं प्रमुख (एमटीडी)

New Delhi, the 1st February, 2008

**S. O. 243.**— In pursuance of clause (b) of sub-rule (1) of Rule 7 of the Bureau of Indian Standards Rules, 1987, the Bureau of Indian Standards hereby notifies that the Indian Standards, particulars of which are given in the Schedule hereto annexed have been established on the date indicated against each :

#### SCHEDULE

Sl. No.	No. title and Year of the Indian Standards Established	No. and Year of the Indian Standards, if any, Superseded by the New Indian Standard	Date of Established
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
1	IS/ISO 16160:2005 Continuously, Hot-Rolled Steel Sheet Products— Dimensional and Shape Tolerances.	—	30 November, 2007

Copy of this Standard is available for sale with the Bureau of Indian Standards, Manak Bhavan, 9, Bahadur Shah Zafar Marg, New Delhi-110002 and Regional Offices: New Delhi, Kolkata, Chandigarh, Chennai, Mumbai and also Branch Offices : Ahmedabad, Bangalore, Bhopal, Bhubaneswar, Coimbatore, Guwahati, Hyderabad, Jaipur, Kanpur, Nagpur, Patna, Pune, Thiruvananthapuram.

[Ref: MTD-4/T-214]

DR. (Mrs.) SNEH BHATLA, Sc.-F. & Head (Met Engg.)

नई दिल्ली, 1 फरवरी, 2008

**का. आ. 244.**—केन्द्रीय सरकार राजभाषा (संघ के शासकीय प्रयोजनों के लिए प्रयोग) नियम, 1976 के नियम 10 के उप-नियम (4) के अनुसरण में उपभोक्ता मामले, खाद्य और सार्वजनिक वितरण मंत्रालय (खाद्य और सार्वजनिक वितरण विभाग) के प्रशासनिक नियंत्रणाधीन भारतीय खाद्य निगम के निम्नलिखित कार्यालयों, जिनके 80 प्रतिशत से अधिक कर्मचारीवृन्द ने हिन्दी का कार्यसाधक ज्ञान प्राप्त कर लिया है, को अधिसूचित करती है :-

1. भारतीय खाद्य निगम  
जिला कार्यालय, लुधियाना  
(पंजाब)
2. भारतीय खाद्य निगम,  
जिला कार्यालय, सम्बलपुर  
(उड़ीसा)
3. भारतीय खाद्य निगम,  
जिला कार्यालय, जयपुर  
(उड़ीसा)

[सं. ई-11011/1/2008-हिन्दी]

सिराज हुसैन, संयुक्त सचिव

New Delhi, the 1st February, 2008

**S. O. 244.**— In pursuance of Sub-rule (4) of rule 10 of the Official Language (use for official purpose of the Union) Rules, 1976 the Central Government hereby notifies the following officers of Food Corporation of India under the administrative control of the Ministry of Consumer Affairs, Food & Public Distribution (Department of Food & Public Distribution, whereof more than 80% of staff have acquired the working knowledge of Hindi :



1. Food Corporation of India,  
Distt. Office, Ludhiana, (Punjab)
2. Food Corporation of India,  
Distt Office, Sambalpur,  
(Orissa).
3. Food Corporation of India,  
Distt Office, Jeypore, (Orissa)

[No. E-11011/1/2008-Hindi]

SIRAJ HUSAIN, Jt. Secy.

**शहरी विकास मंत्रालय**

(संपदा निदेशालय)

नई दिल्ली, 5 फरवरी, 2008

का. आ. 245.—लोक परिसर (अनधिकृत अधिभोगियों की बेदखली) अधिनियम, 1971 (1971 का 40) के अनुच्छेद 3 द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, केन्द्रीय सरकार एतद्वारा नीचे दी गई तालिका के कॉलम (i) में उल्लिखित अधिकारी को, जो भारत सरकार का राजपत्रित अधिकारी है, कथित अधिनियम के प्रयोजन हेतु संपदा अधिकारी नियुक्त करती है जो प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करेगा और कथित तालिका के कॉलम (2) में विनिर्धारित लोक परिसरों के संबंध में अपने अधिकार क्षेत्र की सीमा के भीतर कथित अधिनियम के द्वारा अथवा उसके तहत संपदा अधिकारी को सौंपे गए कार्यों का निष्पादन करेगा।

**तालिका**

अधिकारी का नाम व पदनाम	अधिकार क्षेत्र लोक परिसर सीमाओं की श्रेणियाँ
(1)	(2)
संपदा सहायक प्रबंधक, 5, एस्पलनेड ईस्ट, कोलकाता, वेस्ट बंगाल, पिन कोड-700069	संपदा निदेशालय के नियंत्रणाधीन सभी सामान्य पूल रिहायशी आवास एवं केंद्रीय सरकारी कार्यालय

[फा. सं. डी-11020/01/2007-प्रादेशिक]

आर. एन. यादव, संपदा उप निदेशक

**MINISTRY OF URBAN DEVELOPMENT**

(DIRECTORATE OF ESTATES)

New Delhi, the 5th February, 2008

S.O. 245.—In exercise of the powers conferred by the Section 3 of the Public Premises (Eviction of Unauthorized Occupants) Act, 1971 (40 of 1971), the Central Government hereby appoints the officer mentioned in column(1) of the Table below, who is a Gazetted Officer of the Government of India, to be Estate Officer for the purpose of the said Act, who shall exercise the powers conferred, and perform the duties imposed on the Estate Officer by or under the said Act within the limits of his jurisdiction in respect of the public premises specified in column (2) of the said Table, namely :—

**TABLE**

Designation of the Officer	Categories of Public Premises limits of jurisdiction
(1)	(2)
Assistant Estate Manager, 5, Esplanade East, Kolkata, West Bengal, Pin Code-700069.	All General Pool Residential Accommodation and Central Government Offices under control of Directorate of Estates

[F. No. D-11020/01/2007-Regions]

R. N. YADAV, Dy. Director of Estates

367 GI/08-3

**पेट्रोलियम और प्राकृतिक गैस मंत्रालय**

नई दिल्ली, 4 फरवरी, 2008

**का.आ. 246.**—केन्द्रीय सरकार ने पेट्रोलियम और खनिज पाइपलाइन (भूमि में उपयोग के अधिकार का अर्जन) अधिनियम, 1962 (1962 का 50) (जिसे इसमें इसके पश्चात् उक्त अधिनियम कहा गया है) की धारा 3 की उपधारा (1) के अधीन जारी की गई भारत सरकार के पेट्रोलियम और प्राकृतिक गैस मंत्रालय की अधिसूचना संख्या का.आ. 21 तारीख 3 जनवरी, 2007 जो भारत के राजपत्र तारीख 6 जनवरी, 2007 में प्रकाशित की गई थी; द्वारा उस अधिसूचना से संलग्न अनुसूची में विनिर्दिष्ट भूमि में मध्य प्रदेश राज्य में मांगल्या (इंदौर) संस्थापन से हरियाणा राज्य में पियाला तथा दिल्ली राष्ट्रीय राजधानी क्षेत्र में बिजवासन तक पेट्रोलियम उत्पादकों के परिवहन के लिये मुंबई-मांगल्या पाइपलाइन विस्तार परियोजना के माध्यम से भारत पेट्रोलियम कारपोरेशन लिमिटेड द्वारा एक विस्तार पाइपलाइन बिछाने के प्रयोजन के लिए उपयोग के अधिकार का अर्जन के अपने आशय की घोषणा की थी;

और उक्त राजपत्र की अधिसूचना की प्रतियां जनता को तारीख 13 अक्टूबर, 2007 को उपलब्ध करा दी गई थीं;

और सक्षम प्राधिकारी ने, उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 6 की उपधारा (1) के अधीन, केन्द्रीय सरकार को अपनी रिपोर्ट दे दी है;

और केन्द्रीय सरकार ने, उक्त रिपोर्ट पर विचार करने के पश्चात् और यह समाधान हो जाने पर कि उक्त भूमि पाइपलाइन बिछाने के लिये अपेक्षित है, उसमें उपयोग के अधिकार का अर्जन करने का विनिश्चय किया है;

अतः अब, केन्द्रीय सरकार, उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 6 की उप धारा (1) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, यह घोषणा करती है कि इस अधिसूचना से संलग्न अनुसूची में विनिर्दिष्ट भूमि में पाइपलाइन बिछाने के उपयोग के अधिकार का अर्जन किया जाता है;

और केन्द्रीय सरकार उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 6 की उपधारा (4) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, यह निदेश देती है कि उक्त भूमि में उपयोग का अधिकार इस घोषणा के प्रकाशन की तारीख को केन्द्रीय सरकार में निहित होने की बजाए, सभी विल्लंगमों से मुक्त, भारत पेट्रोलियम कारपोरेशन लिमिटेड में निहित होगा।

**अनुसूची**

तहसील : छाता		जिला : मथुरा	राज्य: उत्तर प्रदेश
क्र.सं.	ग्राम का नाम	सर्वे नंबर	क्षेत्रफल हेक्टेयर में
1.	बरचावली	190	0.056
		225	0.0198
		261	0.0980
		273	0.0324

[फा. सं. आर-31015/4/2005-ओ आर-II]

ए. गोस्वामी, अवर सचिव

**MINISTRY OF PETROLEUM AND NATURAL GAS**

New Delhi, the 4th February, 2008

**S.O. 246.**—Whereas by a notification of the Government of India in the Ministry of Petroleum and Natural Gas, S.O. No. 21 and dated 3rd January, 2007, issued under Sub-section (1) of Section 3 of the Petroleum and Minerals Pipelines (Acquisition of Right of User Land) Act, 1962 (50 of 1962) (hereinafter referred to as the said Act) published in the Gazette of India dated 6th January, 2007, the Central Government declared its intention to acquire the right of user land, specified in Scheduled appended to that notification for the purpose of laying an extension pipeline for transportation of petroleum product through Mumbai-Manglya Pipeline Extension Project from Manglya (Indore) terminal in the State of Madhya Pradesh to Piyala in the State of Haryana and Bijwasan in the NCT of Delhi by Bharat Petroleum Corporation Limited;

And whereas the copies of the said Gazette notification were made available to the public on 13th October, 2007;

And whereas the competent authority has, under sub-section (1) of Section 6 of the said Act, submitted report to the Central Government;

And whereas the Central Government, after considering the said report and on being satisfied that said land is required for laying the pipeline, has decided to acquire the right of user therein;

Now, therefore, in exercise of powers conferred by sub-section (1) of Section 6 of the said Act, Central Government hereby declares that the right of user in the said land specified in Schedule, appended to this notification, is hereby acquired for laying pipeline;

And further, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub section (4) of the Section 6 of the said Act, the Central Government hereby directs that the right of user in the said land for laying the pipeline shall, instead of vesting in the Central Government, vest on the date of the publication of this declaration, in Bharat Petroleum Corporation Limited, free from all encumbrances.

**SCHEDULE**

Tehsil-Chhata		Dist:-Mathura	State: Uttar Pradesh
S.No.	Name of Village	Survey No.	Area in Hectare
1.	Barchawali	190	0.056
		225	0.0198
		261	0.0980
		273	0.0324

[F. No. R-31015/4/2005-OR-II]

A. GOSWAMI, Under Secy.

नई दिल्ली, 4 फरवरी, 2008

का.आ. 247.—केन्द्रीय सरकार ने पेट्रोलियम और खनिज पाइपलाइन (भूमि में उपयोग के अधिकार का अर्जन) अधिनियम, 1962 (1962 का 50) (जिसे इसमें इसके पश्चात् उक्त अधिनियम कहा गया है) की धारा 3 की उपधारा (1) के अधीन जारी की गई भारत सरकार के पेट्रोलियम और प्राकृतिक गैस मंत्रालय की अधिसूचना संख्या का.आ. 19 तारीख 3 जनवरी, 2007 जो भारत के राजपत्र तारीख 6 जनवरी, 2007 में प्रकाशित की गई थी, द्वारा उस अधिसूचना से संलग्न अनुसूची में विनिर्दिष्ट भूमि में मध्य प्रदेश राज्य में मांगल्या (इंदौर) संस्थापन से हरियाणा राज्य में पियाला तथा दिल्ली राष्ट्रीय राजधानी क्षेत्र में बिजवासन तक पेट्रोलियम उत्पादकों के परिवहन के लिये मुंबई-मांगल्या पाइपलाइन विस्तार परियोजना के माध्यम से भारत पेट्रोलियम कारपोरेशन लिमिटेड द्वारा एक विस्तार पाइपलाइन बिछाने के प्रयोजन के लिए उपयोग के अधिकार का अर्जन के अपने आशय की घोषणा की थी;

और उक्त राजपत्र अधिसूचना की प्रतियां जनता को तारीख 13 अक्टूबर, 2007 को उपलब्ध करा दी गई थीं;

और सक्षम प्राधिकारी ने, उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 6 की उपधारा (1) के अधीन, केन्द्रीय सरकार को अपनी रिपोर्ट दे दी है;

और केन्द्रीय सरकार ने, उक्त रिपोर्ट पर विचार करने के पश्चात् और यह समाधान हो जाने पर कि उक्त भूमि पाइपलाइन बिछाने के लिये अपेक्षित है, उसमें उपयोग के अधिकार का अर्जन करने का विनिश्चय किया है;

अतः अब, केन्द्रीय सरकार, उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 6 की उपधारा (1) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, यह घोषणा करती है कि इस अधिसूचना से संलग्न अनुसूची में विनिर्दिष्ट भूमि में पाइपलाइन बिछाने के उपयोग के अधिकार का अर्जन किया जाता है;

और केन्द्रीय सरकार उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 6 की उपधारा (4) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, यह निदेश देती है कि उक्त भूमि में उपयोग का अधिकार इस घोषणा के प्रकाशन की तारीख को केन्द्रीय सरकार में निहित होने की बजाए, सभी विल्लंगमों से मुक्त, भारत पेट्रोलियम कारपोरेशन लिमिटेड में निहित होगा।

## अनुसूची

तहसील : छाता जिला: मथुरा राज्य: उत्तर प्रदेश			
क्र. सं.	ग्राम का नाम	सर्वे नंबर	क्षेत्रफल हेक्टेयर में
1	2	3	4
1.	आझईकला	5	0.0420
2.	आझईखुर्द	1120	0.0675
		1226	0.0078
		1228	0.0226
		1231	0.0214
		1247	0.0296

1	2	3	4
3.	अजनौठी	30	0.0290
		31	0.0044
		398	0.0560
		457	0.0144
		470	0.0810
4.	अकबरपुर	1	0.0820
		10	0.0032
		12	0.0032
		40	0.0702
		96	0.0408
		135	0.1920
		210	0.0150
		272	0.0450
		273	0.0012
		417	0.0048
		967	0.0150
5.	बरौली	60	0.0140
		72	0.0114
		103	0.0050
		112	0.0576
		119	0.0144
		120	0.0066
		135	0.0470
6.	चौमुहा	605	0.0010
		669	0.1326
		1040	0.0210
		1072	0.0570
		1073	0.0864
		1080	0.0300
		1085	0.0108
7.	खरौट	437	0.5694
		443	0.0110
		658	0.1334
		661	0.1320
		675	0.0020
		680	0.1240
		688	0.1602
		1338	0.0852
		1358	0.2394

1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4
8.	सैमरी	275	0.1300	11.	छाताखास—जारी	817	0.0250
		325	0.1308			823	0.0864
		336	0.0050			845/1	0.0100
9.	हथाना	793/3	0.0210			889	0.0928
		796	0.0522			890	0.0828
		797	0.0370			892	0.0100
		973	0.1040			909	0.0484
		1022	0.1667				
		1024	0.0225				
		1032	0.0300				
		1075	0.0012				
		1148	0.1170				
		1150	0.1090				
		1152	0.2050				
10.	फालौम	115	0.0210				
		120	0.0396				
		128	0.0684				
		130	0.0300				
		131	0.0540				
		132	0.0120				
		208/5	0.0352				
		212	0.0370				
		435	0.0594				
		438	0.1182				
		467	0.1710				
		520	0.0270				
		523	0.1240				
		587	0.0500				
		593	0.0226				
		611	0.0860				
11.	छाताखास	546	0.0102				
		549	0.0138				
		590	0.0516				
		696	0.0386				
		706	0.0354				
		708	0.0140				
		758	0.0420				
		768	0.0480				
		791	0.0100				
		813	0.0065				
		815	0.0196				

[फा. सं. आर.-31015/4/2005-ओ आर-II]

ए. गोस्वामी, अवर सचिव

New Delhi, the 4th February, 2008

**S.O. 247.**—Whereas by a notification of the Government of India in the Ministry of Petroleum and Natural Gas, S.O. No.19 and dated 3rd January, 2007, issued under sub-section (1) of Section 3 of the Petroleum and Minerals Pipelines (Acquisition of Right of User Land) Act, 1962 (50 of 1962) (hereinafter referred to as the said Act) published in the Gazette of India dated 6th January, 2007, the Central Government declared its intention to acquire the right of user land, specified in Scheduled appended to that notification for the purpose of laying an extension pipeline for transportation of petroleum product through Mumbai-Manglya Pipeline Extension Project from Manglya (Indore) terminal in the State of Madhya Pradesh to Piyala in the State of Haryana and Bijwasan in the NCT of Delhi by Bharat Petroleum Corporation Limited;

And whereas the copies of the said Gazette notification were made available to the public on 13th October, 2007;

And whereas the competent authority has, under sub-section (1) of Section 6 of the said Act, submitted report to the Central Government;

And whereas the Central Government, after considering the said report and on being satisfied that said land is required for laying the pipeline, has decided to acquire the right of user therein;

Now, therefore, in exercise of powers conferred by sub-section (1) of Section 6 of the said Act, Central Government hereby declares that the right of user in the said land specified in Schedule, appended to this notification, is hereby acquired for laying pipeline;

And further, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub section (4) of the Section 6 of the said Act, the Central Government hereby directs that the right of user in the said land for laying the pipeline shall, instead of vesting in the Central Government, vest on the date of the publication of this declaration, in Bharat Petroleum Corporation Limited, free from all encumbrances.

SCHEDULE				1	2	3	4
Tehsil-Chhata	Dist-Mathura	State-Uttar Pradesh		7.	Kharot—(Contd.)	675	0.0020
S.No.	Name of Village	Survey No.	Area in hectare			680	0.1240
1	2	3	4			688	0.1602
						1338	0.0852
1.	Aajhaikalan	5	0.0420			1358	0.2394
2.	Aajhaikhurd	1120	0.0675	8.	Senmari	275	0.1300
		1226	0.0078			325	0.1308
		1228	0.0226			336	0.0050
		1231	0.0214	9.	Hathana	793/3	0.0210
		1247	0.0296			796	0.0522
3.	Ajanauthi	30	0.0290			797	0.0370
		31	0.0044			973	0.1040
		398	0.0560			1022	0.1667
		457	0.0144			1024	0.0225
		470	0.0810			1032	0.0300
4.	Akbarpur	1	0.0820			1075	0.0012
		10	0.0032			1148	0.1170
		12	0.0032			1150	0.1090
		40	0.0702			1152	0.2050
		96	0.0408	10.	Phalain	115	0.0210
		135	0.1920			120	0.0396
		210	0.0150			128	0.0684
		272	0.0450			130	0.0300
		273	0.0012			131	0.0540
		417	0.0048			132	0.0120
		967	0.0150			20815	0.0352
5.	Barouli	60	0.0140			212	0.0370
		72	0.0114			435	0.0594
		103	0.0050			438	0.1182
		112	0.0576			467	0.1710
		119	0.0144			520	0.0270
		120	0.0066			523	0.1240
		135	0.0470			587	0.0500
6.	Chaumuhan	605	0.0010			593	0.0226
		669	0.1326			611	0.0860
		1040	0.0210	11.	Chhatakhas	546	0.0102
		1072	0.0570			549	0.0138
		1073	0.0864			690	0.0516
		1080	0.0300			696	0.0386
		1085	0.0108			706	0.0354
7.	Kharot	437	0.5694			708	0.0140
		443	0.0110			758	0.0420
		658	0.1334			758	0.0480
		661	0.1320			791	0.0100
						813	0.0065

367 GI/08-4

1	2	3	4
1.Chhatakh—(Contd.)	815	0.0196	
	817	0.0250	
	823	0.0864	
	845/1	0.0100	
	889	0.0928	
	890	0.0828	
	892	0.0100	
	909	0.0484	

[F.No. R-31015/4/2005-OR-II]

A. GOSWAMI, Under Secy.

नई दिल्ली, 4 फरवरी, 2008

का.आ. 248.—केन्द्रीय सरकार ने पेट्रोलियम और खनिज पाइपलाइन (भूमि में उपयोग के अधिकार का अर्जन) अधिनियम, 1962 (1962 का 50) (जिसे इसमें इसके पश्चात् उक्त अधिनियम कहा गया है) की धारा 3 की उपधारा (1) के अधीन जारी की गई भारत सरकार की पेट्रोलियम और प्राकृतिक गैस मंत्रालय की अधिसूचना संख्या का.आ. 20 तारीख 3 जनवरी, 2007 जो भारत के राजपत्र तारीख 6 जनवरी, 2007 में प्रकाशित की गई थी, द्वारा उस अधिसूचना में संलग्न अनुसूची में विनिर्दिष्ट भूमि में मध्य प्रदेश राज्य में मांगल्या इंदौर संस्थापन से हरियाणा राज्य में पियाला तथा दिल्ली राष्ट्रीय बिजधानी क्षेत्र में बिजवासन तक पेट्रोलियम उत्पादकों के परिवहन के लिये मुंबई-मांगल्या पाइपलाइन विस्तार परियोजना के माध्यम से भारत पेट्रोलियम कारपोरेशन लिमिटेड द्वारा एक विस्तार पाइपलाइन ब्रछाने के प्रयोजन के लिए उपयोग के अधिकार का अर्जन के अपने माशय की घोषणा की थी;

और उक्त राजपत्र अधिसूचना की प्रतियां जनता को तारीख 3 अक्टूबर, 2007 को उपलब्ध करा दी गई थीं;

और सक्षम प्राधिकारी ने, उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 6 की उपधारा (1) के अधीन, केन्द्रीय सरकार को अपनी रिपोर्ट दे दी है;

और केन्द्रीय सरकार ने, उक्त रिपोर्ट पर विचार करने के पश्चात् और यह समाधान हो जाने पर कि उक्त भूमि पाइपलाइन ब्रछाने के लिये अपेक्षित है, उसमें उपयोग के अधिकार का अर्जन करने का विनिश्चय किया है;

अतः अब, केन्द्रीय सरकार, उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 6 की उपधारा (1) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, यह घोषणा करती है कि इस अधिसूचना से संलग्न अनुसूची में विनिर्दिष्ट भूमि में पाइपलाइन बिछाने के उपयोग के अधिकार का अर्जन किया जाता है;

और केन्द्रीय सरकार उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 6 की उपधारा 4) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, यह निदेश देती है कि उक्त भूमि में उपयोग का अधिकार इस घोषणा के प्रकाशन की तारीख को केन्द्रीय सरकार में निहित होने की बजाए, सभी विल्लंगों में मुक्त, भारत पेट्रोलियम कारपोरेशन लिमिटेड में निहित होगा।

## अनुसूची

तहसील : छाता	जिला मथुरा	राज्य : उत्तर प्रदेश
क्र. सं. ग्राम का नाम	सर्वे नंबर	क्षेत्रफल हेक्टेयर में
1	2	3
1. बहरावली	57	0.0142
	58	0.0048
2. बिडावली	105	0.0280
3. चन्दौरी	107	0.0170
	119	0.0100
	132	0.0374
	138	0.0112
	195	0.0086
	199	0.0074
	202	0.0042
	321	0.0210
4. गुहेता सतबिसा	66	0.0100
	70	0.0010
	76	0.0132
	77	0.0014
	79	0.0160
	203	0.0014
	250	0.0884

[फा. सं.आर-31015/4/2005-ओ आर-II]

ए. गोस्वामी, अवर सचिव

New Delhi, the 4th February, 2008

S.O. 248.—Whereas by a notification of the Government of India in the Ministry of Petroleum and Natural Gas, S.O. No. 20 and dated 3rd January, 2007, issued under sub-section (1) of Section 3 of the Petroleum and Minerals Pipelines (Acquisition of Right of User Land) Act, 1962 (50 of 1962) (herein after referred to as the said Act) published in the Gazette of India dated 6th January, 2007, the Central Government declared its intention to acquire the right of user land, specified in Schedule appended to that notification for the purpose of laying an extension pipeline for transportation of petroleum product through Mumbai-Manglya Pipeline Extension Project from Manglya (Indore) terminal in the State of Madhya Pradesh to Piyala in the State of Haryana and Bijwasan in the NCT of Delhi by Bharat Petroleum Corporation Limited;

And whereas the copies of the said Gazette Notification were made available to the public on 13th October, 2007;

And whereas the competent authority has, under sub-section (1) of Section 6 of the said Act, submitted report to the Central Government;

And whereas the Central Government, after considering the said report and on being satisfied that said land is required for laying the pipeline, has decided to acquire the right of user therein;

Now, therefore, in exercise of powers conferred by sub-section (1) of Section 6 of the said Act, Central Government hereby declares that the right of user in the said land, specified in Schedule, appended to this notification, is hereby acquired for laying pipeline;

And further, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub section (4) of the Section 6 of the said Act, the Central Government hereby directs that the right of user in the said land for laying the pipeline shall, instead of vesting in the Central Government, vest on the date of the publication of this declaration, in Bharat Petroleum Corporation Limited, free from all encumbrances.

#### SCHEDULE

Tesil-Chhata		Dist-Mathura	State : Uttar Pradesh
S.No.	Name of Village	Survey No.	Area in hectare
1	2	3	4
1.	Baharwali	57	0.0142
		58	0.0048
2.	Bidawali	105	0.0280
3.	Chandauri	107	0.0170
		119	0.0100
		132	0.0374
		138	0.0112
		195	0.0086
		199	0.0074
		202	0.0042
		321	0.0210
4.	Guheta Satbisa	66	0.0100
		70	0.0010
		76	0.0132
		77	0.0014
		79	0.0160
		203	0.0014
		250	0.0884

[F. No. R-31015/4/2005-OR-II]

A. GOSWAMI, Under Secy.

नई दिल्ली, 4 फरवरी, 2008

का.आ. 249.—केन्द्रीय सरकार को लोकहित में यह आवश्यक प्रतीत होता है कि मध्य प्रदेश राज्य में बीना संस्थापन से राजस्थान राज्य में कोटा तक पेट्रोलियम उत्पादों के परिवहन के लिए भारत

पेट्रोलियम कार्पोरेशन लिमिटेड द्वारा, एक पाइपलाईन बिछाई जानी चाहिए;

और केन्द्रीय सरकार को ऐसी पाइपलाईन बिछाने के प्रयोजन के लिए यह आवश्यक प्रतीत होता है कि ऐसी भूमि में, जो इससे उपाबद्ध अनुसूची में वर्णित है, जिसमें उक्त पाइपलाईन बिछाए जाने का प्रस्ताव है, उपयोग के अधिकार का अर्जन किया जाए;

अतः अब, केन्द्रीय सरकार, पेट्रोलियम और खनिज पाइपलाईन (भूमि में उपयोग के अधिकार का अर्जन) अधिनियम, 1962 (1962 का 50) की धारा 3 की उपधारा (1) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, उस भूमि में उपयोग के अधिकार का अर्जन करने के अपने आशय की घोषणा करती है;

कोई व्यक्ति, जो उक्त अनुसूची में वर्णित भूमि में हितबद्ध है, उस तारीख से जिसको इस अधिसूचना से युक्त भारत के राजपत्र की प्रतियां साधारण जनता को उपलब्ध करा दी जाती है, इक्कीस दिन के भीतर भूमि के नीचे पाइपलाईन बिछाए जाने के लिये उसमें उपयोग के अधिकार का अर्जन के सम्बन्ध में श्रीमती भगवन्ती जैठवानी, सक्षम प्राधिकारी, बीना-कोटा पाइपलाईन परियोजना, भारत पेट्रोलियम कार्पोरेशन लिमिटेड, बी-105, इन्द्रा विहार तलवण्डी, कोटा-324005 (राजस्थान) को लिखित रूप में आक्षेप भेज सकेगा।

#### अनुसूची

तहसील : लाइपुरा		जिला : कोटा	राज्य : राजस्थान
क्र.सं.	ग्राम का नाम	सर्वे नंबर	क्षेत्रफल (हेक्टर में)
1	2	3	4
1.	डाहरा	338	0.0468
		336	0.2466
		336/383	0.2340
		335	0.0234
		334	0.0990
		333	0.0020
		329	0.0450
		327	0.2520
		328	0.0020
		325	0.0594
		321	0.1404
		320	0.2088
		319	0.0810
		318	0.0144
2.	कैथोड़ी	241	0.0108
		240	0.2412
		229	0.1656
		238	0.0432
		230/251	0.0216
		230	0.1296

1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4
2.	कैथोड़ी—(जारी)	234	0.5400	4.	बृजेशपुरा—(जारी)	465	0.0864
		179	0.0018			467	0.0020
		180	0.0396			468	0.2124
		175	0.1512			451	0.0020
		176	0.0018			469	0.0054
		173	0.2772			458	0.0234
		173/243	0.0288			459	0.0540
		166	0.5256			453	0.0720
		166/278	0.2664			411	0.0450
		163	0.0018			410	0.0306
		161	0.1440			409	0.0180
		156	0.2970			386	0.1404
		158	0.0666			382	0.0720
		159	0.0018			387	0.0054
3.	गोदल्याहेड़ी	17	0.2556	5.	रसुलपुर	12	0.0040
		16	0.0882			13	0.2520
		15	0.1386			14	0.0300
		13	0.2286			15	0.0300
		12	0.2124			17	0.2430
		10	0.2376			18	0.0070
		9	0.2844			19	0.0220
		8	0.1098			20	0.1050
		7	0.0918			21	0.0090
		6/596	0.0936	6.	ताथेड़	764	0.0738
		5	0.1476			765	0.3258
		3	0.3852			769	0.2808
		4	0.2970			768	0.0054
		1	0.0270			772	0.1818
4.	बृजेशपुरा	540	0.0990			773	0.2394
		539	0.2106			774	0.1944
		538	0.0270			774/857	0.0756
		537	0.0432			777	0.2418
		536	0.0360			817	0.0828
		520	0.0216			819	0.0036
		515	0.0108			818	0.0954
		514	0.1800			826	0.0828
		478	0.1692			828	0.0360
		479	0.2340			829	0.0054
		480	0.0020			831	0.0420
		481	0.0810			830	0.0380
		482	0.0020			833	0.4710
		485	0.1008			844	0.1140
		472	0.0090			844/882	0.0126
		462	0.0284			845	0.2250
		463	0.0284			852	0.1240
		464	0.1800			847/929	0.0026

[फा. सं. आर-31015/7/2008-ओआर-II]

ए. गोस्वामी, अवर सचिव



New Delhi, the 4th February, 2008

**S.O. 249.**—Whereas it appears to the Central Government that it is necessary in the public interest that for the transportation of petroleum products from Bina terminal in the State of Madhya Pradesh, Pipeline to Kota in the State of Rajasthan should be laid by Bharat Petroleum Corporation Limited;

And whereas it appears to the Central Government that for the purpose of laying such pipeline it is necessary to acquire the right of user in land under which the said pipeline is proposed to be laid and which is described in the Schedule annexed hereto;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) of section 3 of the Petroleum and Minerals Pipelines (Acquisition of Right of User in Land) Act, 1962 (50 of 1962), the Central Government hereby declares its intention to acquire the right of user therein;

Any person, interested in the land described in the said Schedule may within twenty one days from the date on which copies of the Gazette of India containing this notification are made available to the public, object in writing to the acquisition of the right of user therein for laying of the pipeline under the land to Smt. Bhagwanti Jethwani, Competent Authority, Bina-Kota Pipeline Project, Bharat Petroleum Corporation Limited, B-105 Indra Vihar Talwandi, Kota - 324005 ( Rajasthan).

**SCHEDULE****Tehsil : Ladpura District : Kota State: Rajasthan**

S.No.	Name of Village	Survey No.	Area in Hectare
1	2	3	4
1.	Dahra	338	0.0468
		336	0.2466
		336/383	0.2340
		335	0.0234
		334	0.0990
		333	0.0020
		329	0.0450
		327	0.2520
		328	0.0020
		325	0.0594
		321	0.1404
		320	0.2088
		319	0.0810
		318	0.0144
2.	Kaithodi	241	0.0108
		240	0.2412
		229	0.1656
		238	0.0432
		230/251	0.0216

1	2	3	4
	Kaithodi Contd...	230	0.1296
		234	0.5400
		179	0.0018
		180	0.0396
		175	0.1512
		176	0.0018
		173	0.2772
		173/243	0.0288
		166	0.5256
		166/278	0.2664
		163	0.0018
		161	0.1440
		156	0.2970
		158	0.0666
		159	0.0018
3.	Godlyahedi	17	0.2556
		16	0.0882
		15	0.1386
		13	0.2286
		12	0.2124
		10	0.2376
		9	0.2844
		8	0.1098
		7	0.0918
		6/596	0.0936
		5	0.1476
		3	0.3852
		4	0.2970
		1	0.0270
4.	Brijeshpura	540	0.0990
		539	0.2106
		538	0.0270
		537	0.0432
		536	0.0360
		520	0.0216
		515	0.0108
		514	0.1800
		478	0.1692
		479	0.2340
		480	0.0020
		481	0.0810
		482	0.0020
		485	0.1008
		472	0.0090

1	2	3	4
4	Brijeshpura (Contd.)	462 463 464 465 467 468 451 469 458 459 453 411 410 409 386 382 387	0.0284 0.0284 0.1800 0.0864 0.0020 0.2124 0.0020 0.0054 0.0234 0.0540 0.0720 0.0450 0.0306 0.0180 0.1404 0.0720 0.0054
5.	Rasulur	12 13 14 15 17 18 19 20 21	0.0040 0.2520 0.0300 0.0300 0.2430 0.0070 0.0220 0.1050 0.0090
6.	Tathed	764 765 769 768 772 773 774 774/857 777 817 819 818 826 828 829 831 830 833 844 844/882	0.0738 0.3258 0.2808 0.0054 0.1818 0.2394 0.1944 0.0756 0.2418 0.0828 0.0036 0.0954 0.0828 0.0360 0.0054 0.0420 0.0380 0.4710 0.1140 0.0126

1	2	3	4
	Tathed (Contd.)	845 852 847/929	0.2250 0.1240 0.0026

[F.No.R-31015/7/2008-OR-II]

A. GOSWAMI, Under Secy.

नई दिल्ली, 4 फरवरी, 2008

का.आ. 250.—केन्द्रीय सरकार को लोकहित में यह आवश्यक प्रतीत होता है कि मध्य प्रदेश राज्य में बीना संस्थापन से राजस्थान राज्य में कोटा तक पेट्रोलियम उत्पादों के परिवहन के लिए भारत पेट्रोलियम कार्पोरेशन लिमिटेड द्वारा एक पाइपलाइन बिछाई जानी चाहिए;

और केन्द्रीय सरकार को ऐसी पाइपलाइन बिछाने के प्रयोजन के लिए यह आवश्यक प्रतीत होता है कि ऐसी भूमि में, जो इससे उपाबद्ध अनुसूची में वर्णित है, जिसमें उक्त पाइपलाइन बिछाए जाने का प्रस्ताव है, उपयोग के अधिकार का अर्जन किया जाए;

अतः अब, केन्द्रीय सरकार, पेट्रोलियम और खनिज पाइपलाइन (भूमि में उपयोग के अधिकार के अर्जन) अधिनियम 1962 (1962 का 50), की धारा 3 की उपधारा (1) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए उस भूमि में उपयोग के अधिकार का अर्जन करने के अपने आशय की घोषणा करती है,

कोई व्यक्ति, जो उक्त अनुसूची में वर्णित भूमि में हितबद्ध है, उस तारीख से जिसको इस अधिसूचना से युक्त भारत के राजपत्र की प्रतियां साधारण जनता को उपलब्ध करा दी जाती है, इक्कीस दिन के भीतर भूमि के नीचे पाइपलाइन बिछाए जाने के लिये उसमें उपयोग के अधिकार के अर्जन के सम्बन्ध में श्रीमति भगवन्ती जेठवानी, सक्षम प्राधिकारी, बीना-कोटा पाइपलाइन परियोजना, भारत पेट्रोलियम कार्पोरेशन लिमिटेड, बी-105 इन्द्रा विहार तलवण्डी, कोटा-324005 (राजस्थान) को लिखित रूप में आक्षेप भेज सकेगा।

## अनुसूची

तहसील : दीगोद		जिला : कोटा	राज्य : राजस्थान
क्र. सं.	ग्राम का नाम	सर्वे नंबर	क्षेत्रफल हेक्टेयर में
1	2	3	4
1.	जनकपुर	56	0.0144
		26	0.0600
		50	0.0020
		27	0.1656
		28	0.0900
		24	0.0072
		17	0.0040
		30	0.0072
		16	0.1260
		15	0.0360
		29	0.0720
		25	0.0072

1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4
2.	धोरी	394	0.0020	4.	चौमामालियान	31	0.0216
		401/1	0.0940			32	0.1620
		401	0.0050			33	0.2844
		402	0.3348			53	0.2070
		403	0.1369			52	0.0040
		412	0.0504			51	0.2070
		411	0.0400			48	0.1242
		415	0.0420			46/661	0.1368
		410	0.0720			90	0.2232
		409	0.0050			91	0.1530
		418	0.0360			92	0.0306
		420	0.1080			93	0.0020
		419	0.1224			98	0.2035
		426	0.0144			99	0.0300
		434	0.2232			99/653	0.0020
		433	0.0792			100	0.0500
		438	0.0288			101	0.1000
		443	0.0020			102	0.0125
		444	0.1152			104	0.0216
		445	0.0432			108	0.4082
		445 मि.	0.0252			109	0.0504
		446	0.1872			110	0.0630
		447	0.1368			123	0.4226
		451	0.1296			122	0.7880
		452	0.0720			119	0.0216
		453	0.2160	5.	रेल	785	0.2150
		454	0.0360			782	0.0460
		734	0.2250			781	0.2250
		733	0.0020			786/1375	0.0100
		732	0.0720			786	0.1250
		772	0.0020			789	0.1100
		770	0.0040			790	0.1100
		771	0.0360			788	0.0040
		769	0.0020			791	0.1900
		792	0.0150			809	0.0144
		788	0.2016			810	0.2776
		787	0.0900			814	0.4100
		789	0.0216			813	0.1200
		790	0.2664			982	0.2150
		783	0.0144			983	0.0600
		782	0.1872			867	0.0288
		781	0.0360	6.	भाण्डाहेड़ा	151/1276	0.0216
		780	0.0576			152/1275	0.0020
		676	0.0360			152	0.1404
		643	0.3600			154	0.4084
3.	सेदड़ी	1/284	0.3240			153	0.0576
		1/285	0.2700			155	0.0200
		1	0.3160			150	0.0144
		2	0.0020			148	0.1800
		162	0.0040				

1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4
	भाण्डाहेड़ा	146/1291	0.1620		भाण्डाहेड़ा	582	0.1296
		146	0.4500			580	0.0150
		147	0.1170			1140	0.2180
		132	0.2720			1141	0.1836
		134	0.0200			1147	0.0450
		133	0.0180			1146	0.5220
		98	0.0144			1145	0.0216
		97	0.0720			1154	0.0288
		96	0.1656			1157	0.0252
		95	0.1584			1156	0.5120
		89/1241	0.1800			1162	0.0504
		90	0.1880			1162/1222	0.0504
		294	0.0144			1204	0.1840
		319	0.1440			1205	0.1678
		318	0.0900			1152	0.0684
		318/1268	0.1816	7. बरगू		1	0.3240
		321	0.0736			5	0.0500
		317/1284	0.0630			6	0.2650
		317	0.0100			23	0.1400
		315	0.4140			24	0.1296
		315/1253	0.0900			26	0.2340
		314	0.1224			28	0.1980
		313/1234	0.0100			29	0.1700
		313	0.1000			30	0.0800
		329	0.0288			31	0.0144
		427/1226	0.1872			32	0.0720
		517	0.0144			110	0.1040
		516	0.0288			111	0.0020
		515	0.0864			112	0.0908
		523	0.0360			112/469	0.1944
		525	0.0180			108	0.2160
		529	0.2610			106	0.3600
		533	0.1440			100	0.1980
		530	0.0020			99	0.1800
		532	0.3780			95	0.0288
		549	0.0144			79	0.0144
		548	0.0144			90	0.4428
		548/1312	0.4688			89	0.1120
		555	0.2276			83	0.4250
		556	0.3212			370	0.1000
		559	0.0504			371	0.0125
		570	0.0360			83/472	0.0050
		592	0.2340			372	0.2610
		589	0.2650	8 पोलाईकलां		566	0.1900
		588	0.0260			567	0.0504
		585	0.0080			568	0.0288
		586	0.1440			569/766	0.0648
		587	0.0360			572	0.1728
		583	0.1296			571	0.1512
						578	0.2286
						578/757	0.0576
						579	0.0020

2	3	4
9 नोहती	27	0.0216
	28	0.3240
	17	0.3132
	14	0.0340
	16	0.1000
	102	0.1000
	39	0.0020
	40	0.0020
	86	0.1872
	87	0.1368
	95/393	0.0288
	89	0.1736
	90/387	0.0200
	95	0.0450
	135	0.0216
	137	0.0864
	138	0.0108
	151	0.4212
	157	0.1890
	154	0.0040
	155	0.0020
	156	0.1980
	165	0.0144
	186	0.0900
	187	0.0020
	200	0.0432
	193	0.1008
	195	0.0792
	196	0.0160

[फा. सं.आर-31015/9/2008-ओ आर-II]

ए. गोस्वामी, अवर सचिव

New Delhi, the 4th February, 2008

**S.O. 250.**—Whereas it appears to the Central Government that it is necessary in the public interest that for the transportation of petroleum products from Bina terminal in the State of Madhya Pradesh, Pipeline to Kota in the State of Rajasthan should be laid by Bharat Petroleum Corporation Limited;

And whereas it appears to the Central Government that for the purpose of laying such pipeline it is necessary to acquire the right of user in land under which the said pipeline is proposed to be laid and which is described in the Schedule annexed hereto;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) of section 3 of the Petroleum and Minerals Pipelines (Acquisition of Right of User in Land) Act, 1962 (50 of 1962), the Central Government hereby declares its intention to acquire the right of user therein;

Any person, interested in the land described in the said Schedule may within twenty one days from the date

on which copies of the Gazette of India containing this notification are made available to the public, object in writing to the acquisition of the right of user therein for laying of the pipeline under the land to Smt. Bhagwanti Jethwani, Competent Authority, Bina-kota Pipeline Project, Bharat Petroleum Corporation Limited, B-1105 Indra Vihar Talwandi, Kota - 324005 (Rajasthan).

**SCHEDULE**

Tehsil: Digod		District : Kota		State : Rajasthan	
Sl. No.	Name of Village	Survey No.	Area in Hectare		
1	2	3	4		
1	JANAKPUR	56	0.0144		
		26	0.0600		
		50	0.0020		
		27	0.1656		
		28	0.0900		
		24	0.0072		
		17	0.0040		
		30	0.0072		
		16	0.1260		
		15	0.0360		
		29	0.0720		
		25	0.0072		
2	DHORI	394	0.0020		
		401/1	0.0940		
		401	0.0050		
		402	0.3348		
		403	0.1369		
		412	0.0504		
		411	0.0400		
		415	0.0420		
		410	0.0720		
		409	0.0050		
		418	0.0360		
		420	0.1080		
		419	0.1224		
		426	0.0144		
		434	0.2232		
		433	0.0792		
		438	0.0288		
		443	0.0020		
		444	0.1152		
		445	0.0432		
		445 मि.	0.0252		
		446	0.1872		
		447	0.1368		
		451	0.1296		
		452	0.0720		
		453	0.2160		
		454	0.0360		

1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4
	DHORI	734	0.2250		REL	786/1375	0.0100
		733	0.0020			786	0.1250
		732	0.0720			789	0.1100
		772	0.0020			790	0.1100
		770	0.0040			788	0.0040
		771	0.0360			791	0.1900
		769	0.0020			809	0.0144
		792	0.0150			810	0.2776
		788	0.2016			814	0.4100
		787	0.0900			813	0.1200
		789	0.0216			982	0.2150
		790	0.2664			983	0.0600
		783	0.0144			867	0.0288
		782	0.1872		6 BHANDAHEDA	151/1276	0.0216
		781	0.0360			152/1275	0.0020
		780	0.0576			152	0.1404
		676	0.0360			154	0.4084
		643	0.3600			153	0.0576
3	SADEDHI	1/284	0.3240			155	0.0200
		1/285	0.2700			150	0.0144
		1	0.3160			148	0.1800
		2	0.0020			146/1291	0.1620
		162	0.0040			146	0.4500
4	CHAUMAMALIYAN	31	0.0216			147	0.1170
		32	0.1620			132	0.2720
		33	0.2844			134	0.0200
		53	0.2070			133	0.0180
		52	0.0040			98	0.0144
		51	0.2070			97	0.0720
		48	0.1242			96	0.1656
		46/661	0.1368			95	0.1584
		90	0.2232			89/1241	0.1800
		91	0.1530			90	0.1880
		92	0.0306			294	0.0144
		93	0.0020			319	0.1440
		98	0.2035			318	0.0900
		99	0.0300			318/1268	0.1816
		99/653	0.0020			321	0.0736
		100	0.0500			317/1284	0.0630
		101	0.1000			317	0.0100
		102	0.0125			315	0.4140
		104	0.0216			315/1253	0.0900
		108	0.4082			314	0.1224
		109	0.0504			313/1234	0.0100
		110	0.0630			313	0.1000
		123	0.4226			329	0.0288
		122	0.7880			427/1226	0.1872
		119	0.0216			517	0.0144
5	REL	785	0.2150			516	0.0288
		782	0.0460			515	0.0864
		781	0.2250			523	0.0360

1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4
	BHANDAKELA	525	0.0180		BARGU	100	0.1980
		529	0.2610			99	0.1800
		533	0.1440			95	0.0288
		530	0.0020			79	0.0144
		532	0.3780			90	0.4428
		549	0.0144			89	0.1120
		548	0.0144			83	0.4250
		548/1312	0.4688			370	0.1000
		555	0.2276			371	0.0125
		556	0.3212			83/472	0.0050
		559	0.0504			372	0.2610
		570	0.0360		8 POLAIKALAN	566	0.1900
		592	0.2340			567	0.0504
		589	0.2650			568	0.0288
		588	0.0260			569/766	0.0648
		585	0.0080			572	0.1728
		586	0.1440			571	0.1512
		587	0.0360			578	0.2286
		583	0.1296			578/757	0.0576
		582	0.1296			579	0.0020
		580	0.0150		9 NOHTI	27	0.0216
		1140	0.2180			28	0.3240
		1141	0.1836			17	0.3132
		1147	0.0450			14	0.0340
		1146	0.5220			16	0.1000
		1145	0.0216			102	0.1000
		1154	0.0288			39	0.0020
		1157	0.0252			40	0.0020
		1156	0.5120			86	0.1872
		1162	0.0504			87	0.1368
		1162/1222	0.0504			95/393	0.0288
		1204	0.1840			89	0.1736
		1205	0.1678			90/387	0.0200
		1152	0.0684			95	0.0450
7 BARGU		1	0.3240			135	0.0216
		5	0.0500			137	0.0864
		6	0.2650			138	0.0108
		23	0.1400			151	0.4212
		24	0.1296			157	0.1890
		26	0.2340			154	0.0040
		28	0.1980			155	0.0020
		29	0.1700			156	0.1980
		30	0.0800			165	0.0144
		31	0.0144			186	0.0900
		32	0.0720			187	0.0020
		110	0.1040			200	0.0432
		111	0.0020			193	0.1008
		112	0.0908			195	0.0792
		112/469	0.1944			196	0.0160
		108	0.2160				
		106	0.3600				

[F.No. R-31015/9/2008-OR-II]

A. GOSWAMI, Under Secy.

नई दिल्ली, 31 जनवरी, 2008

का. आ. 251.—केन्द्रीय सरकार को लोकहित में यह आवश्यक प्रतीत होता है कि मध्यप्रदेश राज्य में कोयली से रतलाम तक पेट्रोलियम उत्पादन के परिवहन के लिए इंडियन ऑयल कॉर्पोरेशन लिमिटेड द्वारा एक पाइपलाइन बिछाई जानी चाहिए:

और केन्द्रीय सरकार को उक्त पाइपलाइन बिछाने के प्रयोजन के लिए यह आवश्यक प्रतीत होता है कि उस भूमि में उक्त पाइपलाइन बिछाए जाने का प्रस्ताव है और जो इस अधिसूचना से संलग्न अनुसूची में वर्णित है, उपयोग के अधिकार का अर्जन किया जाए।

अतः अब केन्द्रीय सरकार पेट्रोलियम और खनिज पाइपलाइन (भूमि में उपयोग के अधिकार का अर्जन) अधिनियम 1962 (1962 का 50) की धारा 3 की उपधारा (1) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, उस भूमि में उपयोग के अधिकार का अर्जन करने के अपने आशय की घोषणा करती है।

कोई व्यक्ति, जो उक्त अनुसूची में वर्णित भूमि में हितबद्ध है, उस तारीख से जिसको उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 3 की उपधारा (1) के अधीन भारत के राजपत्र में यथा प्रकाशित इस अधिसूचना की प्रतियाँ साधारण जनता को उपलब्ध करा दी जाती हैं, 21 (इक्कीस) दिन के भीतर भूमि के नीचे पाइपलाइन बिछाए जाने के संबंध में भरतलाल ननामा, सक्षम प्राधिकारी, इंडियन ऑयल कॉर्पोरेशन लिमिटेड पाटीदार हाऊस, गीता मंदिर रोड़-रतलाम-457001 (मध्यप्रदेश) को लिखित रूप से आक्षेप भेज सकेगा।

### अनुसूची

जिला—झाबुआ -		राज्य—मध्यप्रदेश	
तहसील	गाँव का नाम	सर्वे नम्बर	क्षेत्रफल हेक्टर में
1	2	3	4
मेघनगर	1. मेघनगर	123/2	0.0621
		508	0.7914
	2. नवापाड़ा धन्ना	32	0.0787
		33/4	0.0070
		33/5	0.0504
थांदला	3. नौगांवा	900	0.0035
	1. नाहरपुरा	539	0.0810

[फा. सं. आर-25011/1/2005-ओ.आर.-I]

एस. के. चिटकारा, अवर सचिव



New Delhi, the 31st January, 2008

**S. O. 251.**— Whereas, it appears to the Central Government that it is necessary in the public interest that for the transportation of petroleum products from Koyali to Ratlam in the state of Madhya Pradesh, a Pipeline should be laid by the Indian Oil Corporation Limited;

And whereas it appears to the Central Government that for the purpose of laying the said pipeline it is necessary to acquire the right of user in the land under which the said pipeline is proposed to be laid and which is described in the Schedule annexed to this notification;

Now therefore, in exercise of the Powers conferred by sub-section (1) of section 3 of the Petroleum and Mineral Pipelines (Acquisition of Right of User in land) Act, 1962 (50 of 1962), the Central Government hereby declares its intention to acquire the right of user therein;

Any person interested in the land described in the said Schedule may, within twenty-one days from the date on which the copies of this notification; issued under sub-section (1) of section 3 of the said Act, as published in the Gazette of India are made available to the general public, object in writing to the laying of pipeline under the land to Mr. Bharat Lal Nanama, Competent Authority, Indian Oil Corporation Limited, at office Patidar house, Gita mandir Road, Ratlam 457001, (Madhya Pradesh)

### Schedule

District-Jhabua		State-Madhya Pradesh	
Tehsil	Name of Village	Survey No.	Area (in Hectare.)
1	2	3	4
Meghanagar	1. Meghanagar	123/2	0.0621
		508	0.7914
	2. Navapada Dhanna	32	0.0787
		33/4	0.0070
		33/5	0.0504
	3. Naugawa	900	0.0035
Thandla	1. Naharpura	539	0.0810

[F. No. R-25011/1/2005-O.R.-I]  
S.K. CHITKARA, Under Secy.

367 GI/08-7

नई दिल्ली, 31 जनवरी, 2008

का. आ. 252.— केन्द्रीय सरकार को लोकहित में यह आवश्यक प्रतीत होता है कि मध्यप्रदेश राज्य में कोयली से रतलाम तक पेट्रोलियम उत्पादन के परिवहन के लिए इंडियन ऑयल कॉर्पोरेशन लिमिटेड द्वारा एक पाइपलाइन बिछाई जानी चाहिए:

और केन्द्रीय सरकार को उक्त पाइपलाइन बिछाने के प्रयोजन के लिए यह आवश्यक प्रतीत होता है कि उस भूमि में उक्त पाइपलाइन बिछाए जाने का प्रस्ताव है और जो इस अधिसूचना से संलग्न अनुसूची में वर्णित है, उपयोग के अधिकार का अर्जन किया जाए।

अतः अब केन्द्रीय सरकार पेट्रोलियम और खनिज पाइपलाइन (भूमि में उपयोग के अधिकार का अर्जन) अधिनियम 1962 (1962 का 50) की धारा 3 की उपधारा (1) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, उस भूमि में उपयोग के अधिकार का अर्जन करने के अपने आशय की घोषणा करती है।

कोई व्यक्ति, जो उक्त अनुसूची में वर्णित भूमि में हितबद्ध है, उस तारीख से जिसको उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 3 की उपधारा (1) के अधीन भारत के राजपत्र में यथा प्रकाशित इस अधिसूचना की प्रतियाँ साधारण जनता को उपलब्ध करा दी जाती है, 21 (इक्कीस) दिन के भीतर भूमि के नीचे पाइपलाइन बिछाए जाने के संबंध में भरतलाल ननामा, सक्षम प्राधिकारी, इंडियन ऑयल कॉर्पोरेशन लिमिटेड पाटीदार हाऊस, गीता मंदिर रोड़-रतलाम-457001 (मध्यप्रदेश) को लिखित रूप से आक्षेप भेज सकेगा।

### अनुसूची

जिला-रतलाम		राज्य-मध्यप्रदेश	
तहसील	गाँव का नाम	सर्वे नम्बर	क्षेत्रफल हेक्टर में
1	2	3	4
बाजना	1. बिलड़ी	153	0.0720
		147	0.1800
		146	0.1296
		144	0.0792
		142	0.0432

1	2	3	4
बीजता/ बीरी...	1. बिलडी	141	0.2880
		139	0.0072
रतलाम	1. राजपुरा	2/5	0.1944
		2/8	0.1728
		2/6	0.1512
		2/9/1	0.2052
	2. जुलवानिया	43/1	0.3796
		66/2	0.1224
	3. बंजली	8/1	0.1152
		8/3	0.1080
		8/2	0.0396
		8/2/1	0.1260
		25/2	0.0540
		50/2	0.1800
		270/2	0.1867
		273/2	0.1168
		314/4	0.0723
	4. सेजावता	118/4	0.0489
		179	0.1817
	5. बांगरोद	924/5	0.1520
		1402/2	0.0600
		1443/2	0.3198
		1440	0.0600
		1443/3	0.2250
		1490	0.1719
		712/3	0.0900
		712/5	0.0864

New Delhi, the 31st January, 2008

**S. O. 252.**—Whereas, it appears to the Central Government that it is necessary in the public interest that for the transportation of petroleum products from Koyali to Ratlam in the state of Madhya Pradesh, a Pipeline should be laid by the Indian Oil Corporation Limited;

And whereas it appears to the Central Government that for the purpose of laying the said pipeline, it is necessary to acquire the right of user in the land under which the said pipeline is proposed to be laid and which is described in the Schedule annexed to this notification;

Now therefore, in exercise of the Powers conferred by sub-section (1) of section 3 of the Petroleum and Mineral Pipelines (Acquisition of Right of User in land) Act, 1962 (50 of 1962), the Central Government hereby declares its intention to acquire the right of user therein;

Any person interested in the land described in the said Schedule may, within twenty-one days from the date on which the copies of this notification; issued under sub-section (1) of section 3 of the said Act, as published in the Gazette of India are made available to the general public, object in writing to the laying of pipeline under the land to Mr. Bharat Lal Nanama, Competent Authority, Indian Oil Corporation Limited. at office Patidar house, Gita mandir Road, Ratlam 457001, (Madhya Pradesh)

### Schedule

District-Ratlam		State-Madhya Pradesh	
Tehsil	Name of Village	Survey No.	Area (in Hectare.)
1	2	3	4
Bajna	1. Bildi	153	0.0720
		147	0.1800
		146	0.1296
		144	0.0792
		142	0.0432
		141	0.2880
		139	0.0072

1	2	3	4
Ratlam	1. Rajpura	2/5	0.1944
		2/8	0.1728
		2/6	0.1512
		2/9/1	0.2052
	2. Julwaniya	43/1	0.3796
		66/2	0.1224
	3. Banjali	8/1	0.1152
		8/3	0.1080
		8/2	0.0396
		8/2/1	0.1260
		25/2	0.0540
		50/2	0.1800
		270/2	0.1867
		273/2	0.1168
		314/4	0.0723
	4. Sejawata	118/4	0.0489
	5. Bahgrod	179	0.1817
		924/5	0.1520
		1402/2	0.0600
		1443/2	0.3198
		1440	0.0600
		1443/3	0.2250
		1490	0.1719
		712/3	0.0900
		712/5	0.0864

[F. No. R-25011/2/2005-O.R.-I]

S.K. CHITKARA, Under Secy.

367 GI/08-8

नई दिल्ली, 4 फरवरी, 2008

**का. आ. 253.**—भारत सरकार ने पेट्रोलियम और खनिज पाइपलाइन (भूमि में उपयोग के अधिकार का अर्जन), अधिनियम 1962 (1962 का 50) (जिसे इसके पश्चात् उक्त अधिनियम कहा गया है) की धारा 3 की उपधारा (1) के अधीन जारी की गई भारत सरकार के पेट्रोलियम और प्राकृतिक गैस मंत्रालय की अधिसूचना संख्या का.आ. 2238 तारीख 9 जुलाई 2007 द्वारा उस अधिसूचना से संलग्न अनुसूची में विनिर्दिष्ट भूमि में, मैसर्स रिलायन्स इंडस्ट्रीज लिमिटेड, की आन्ध्रप्रदेश राज्य में संरचनाओं से महाराष्ट्र राज्य में ठाणे जिले के विभिन्न उपभोक्ताओं तक प्राकृतिक गैस के परिवहन के लिए मैसर्स रिलायन्स गैस ट्रांसपोर्टेशन इन्फ्रास्ट्रक्चर लिमिटेड द्वारा काकीनाडा-हैदराबाद-उरान-अहमदाबाद गैस पाइपलाइन बिछाने के प्रयोजन के लिए उपयोग के अधिकार का अर्जन के अपने आशय की घोषणा की थी;

और उक्त राजपत्र अधिसूचना की प्रतियाँ जनता को तारीख 30 नवम्बर 2007 को अथवा उससे पूर्व उपलब्ध करा दी गई थीं;

और पाइपलाइन बिछाने के संबंध में जनता की ओर से प्राप्त आक्षेपों पर सक्षम प्राधिकारी द्वारा विचार कर लिया गया है और अननुज्ञात कर दिया गया;

और सक्षम प्राधिकारी ने उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 6 की उपधारा (1) के अधीन, भारत सरकार को अपनी रिपोर्ट दे दी है;

और भारत सरकार ने, उक्त रिपोर्ट पर विचार करने के पश्चात् और यह समाधान हो जाने पर की उक्त भूमि पाइपलाइन बिछाने के लिए अपेक्षित है, उसमें उपयोग के अधिकार का अर्जन करने का विनिश्चय किया है;

अतः अब, भारत सरकार, उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 6 की उपधारा (1) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, यह घोषणा करती है कि इस अधिसूचना से संलग्न अनुसूची में विनिर्दिष्ट भूमि में पाइपलाइन बिछाने के लिए उपयोग के अधिकार का अर्जन किया जाता है;

और, भारत सरकार उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 6 की उपधारा (4) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए यह निर्देश देती है कि उक्त भूमि में उपयोग का अधिकार इस घोषणा के प्रकाशन की तारीख से भारत सरकार में निहित होने के बजाए, सभी वित्तीयों से मुक्त, मैसर्स रिलायन्स गैस ट्रांसपोर्टेशन इन्फ्रास्ट्रक्चर लिमिटेड में निहित होगा।

## अनुसूची

मंडल तालुका : अंबरनाथ		जिला : ठाणे		राज्य : महाराष्ट्र	
गांव का नाम	सर्वे हिस्सा नंबर	आर. ओ. यु. अर्जीत करने के लिये क्षेत्रफल			
		हेक्टेयर	एअर	सि-एअर	
1.	2.	3.	4.	5.	
1) आबेशिव बु.	17/1B	00	17	10	
	19/6A	00	3	29	
2) इंदगाव	10/7	0	0	20	
3) कान्होर	52/1	00	20	92	
	67/4	00	22	46	
	69/2	00	19	84	
	69/9	00	05	52	
	70/4	00	21	00	
	99/1	00	06	24	
	100/3	00	08	94	
	172/1B	00	10	40	

[फा. सं. एल-14014/43/2004-जी. पी.]

के. के. शर्मा, अवर सचिव

New Delhi, the 4th February, 2008

**S. O. 253.**—Whereas by notification of Government of India in Ministry of Petroleum and Natural Gas, number **S.O. 2238 dated: 9th July, 2007** issued under sub-section (1) of Section 3 of the Petroleum and Minerals Pipelines (Acquisition of Right of User in Land) Act, 1962 (50 of 1962) (hereinafter referred to as the said Act), the Government of India declared its intention to acquire the Right of User in the land, specified in the Schedule appended to that notification for the purpose of laying **Kakinada-Hyderabad-Uran-Ahmedabad** gas pipeline for transportation of natural gas from the Structures in Andhra Pradesh of M/s. Reliance Industries Limited, by M/s. Reliance Gas Transportation Infrastructure Limited to various consumers of District Thane in the State of Maharashtra;

And whereas the copies of the said Notification were made available to the public on or before **30th November, 2007**;

And whereas objections received from the public to the laying of the pipeline have been considered and disallowed by the Competent Authority;

And whereas the Competent Authority has under sub-section (1) of Section 6 of the said Act, has submitted his report to the Government of India;

And whereas Government of India after considering the said report and on being satisfied that the said land is required for laying pipeline, has decided to acquire the Right of User therein;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) of Section 6 of the said Act, Government of India hereby declares that the Right of User in the said land specified in the Schedule appended to this notification is hereby acquired, for laying the pipeline;

And further, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (4) of Section 6 of the said Act, Government of India hereby directs that the Right of User in the said land for laying the pipeline shall, instead of vesting in Government of India, vests, on this date of publication of the declaration, in M/s Reliance Gas Transportation Infrastructure Limited free from all encumbrances.

### Schedule

Mandal/Tehsil/Taluka: Ambarnath		District: Thane		State : Maharashtra	
Village	Survey/ Sub-division No.	Area to be acquired for ROU			
		Hectare	Are	C-Are	
1	2	3	4	5	
1) Ambeshiv Bk	17/1B	00	17	10	
	19/8A	00	3	29	
2) Indgaon	10/7	0	0	20	
3) Kanhor	52/1	00	20	92	
	67/4	00	22	46	
	69/2	00	19	84	
	69/9	00	05	52	
	70/4	00	21	00	
	99/1	00	06	24	
	100/3	00	08	94	
	172/1B	00	10	40	

[F. No. L-14014/43/2004-G.P.]  
K. K. SHARMA, Under Secy.

नई दिल्ली, 4 फरवरी, 2008

**का. आ. 254.**—भारत सरकार ने पेट्रोलियम और खनिज पाइपलाइन (भूमि में उपयोग के अधिकार का अर्जन), अधिनियम 1962 (1962 का 50) (जिसे इसके पश्चात् उक्त अधिनियम कहा गया है) की धारा 3 की उपधारा (1) के अधीन जारी की गई भारत सरकार के पेट्रोलियम और प्राकृतिक गैस मंत्रालय की अधिसूचना संख्या का.आ. 2239 तारीख 9 जुलाई 2007 द्वारा उस अधिसूचना से संलग्न अनुसूची में विनिर्दिष्ट भूमि में, मैसर्स रिलायंस इंडस्ट्रीज लिमिटेड, की आन्ध्रप्रदेश राज्य में संरचनाओं से महाराष्ट्र राज्य में ठाणे जिले के विभिन्न उपभोक्ताओं तक प्राकृतिक गैस के परिवहन के लिए मैसर्स रिलायंस गैस ट्रान्सपोर्टेशन इन्फ्रास्ट्रक्चर लिमिटेड द्वारा काकीनाडा-हैदराबाद-उरान-अहमदाबाद गैस पाइपलाइन बिछाने के प्रयोजन के लिए उपयोग के अधिकार का अर्जन के अपने आशय की घोषणा की थी;

और उक्त राजपत्र अधिसूचना की प्रतियाँ जनता को तारीख 30 नवम्बर 2007 को अथवा उससे पूर्व उपलब्ध करा दी गई थीं;

और पाइपलाइन बिछाने के संबंध में जनता की ओर से प्राप्त आक्षेपों पर सक्षम प्राधिकारी द्वारा विचार कर लिया गया है और अननुज्ञात कर दिया गया;

और सक्षम प्राधिकारी ने उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 6 की उपधारा (1) के अधीन, भारत सरकार को अपनी रिपोर्ट दे दी है;

और भारत सरकार ने, उक्त रिपोर्ट पर विचार करने के पश्चात् और यह समाधान हो जाने पर की उक्त भूमि पाइपलाइन बिछाने के लिए अपेक्षित है, उसमें उपयोग के अधिकार का अर्जन करने का विनिश्चय किया है;

अतः अब, भारत सरकार, उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 6 की उपधारा (1) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, यह घोषणा करती है कि इस अधिसूचना से संलग्न अनुसूची में विनिर्दिष्ट भूमि में पाइपलाइन बिछाने के लिए उपयोग के अधिकार का अर्जन किया जाता है;

और, भारत सरकार उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 6 की उपधारा (4) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए यह निर्देश देती है कि उक्त भूमि में उपयोग का अधिकार इस घोषणा के प्रकाशन की तारीख से भारत सरकार में निहित होने के बजाए, सभी विल्लंगमों से मुक्त, मैसर्स रिलायंस गैस ट्रान्सपोर्टेशन इन्फ्रास्ट्रक्चर लिमिटेड में निहित होगा।

## अनुसूची

संडल तहसील तालुका इकल्याण	जिल्हा : ठाणे	राज्य : महाराष्ट्र		
गांव का नाम	सर्वे हिस्सा नंबर	आर. ओ. यु. आर्जित करने के लिये क्षेत्रफल		
		हेक्टेयर	एकर	सि-एकर
1.	2.	3.	4.	5.
1) अनखर	34/1/1	00	01	30
	34/1/3	00	07	00
2) आपटी	29/1	00	10	00
3) गुरवली	12/2	00	04	60
	34/5A	00	04	58
	34/5B	00	05	04
	62/14	00	01	80
4) मांजली	25/5	00	00	30
	31/3	00	06	10
	31/4	00	03	02
	69/6	00	13	50
	69/10	00	20	24
	69/12	00	00	60
	69/20	00	09	90
	69/22	00	11	68



1	2	3	4	5
5) बाहोली	7/9	00	32	23
	14/13	00	20	64
	14/14	00	05	17
	14/15	00	33	81
	94/1	00	03	90
	114/12	00	21	00
6) टिटवाळा	49/6	00	07	91

[फा. सं. एल-14014/42/2004-जी. पी.]

के. के. शर्मा, अवर सचिव

New Delhi, the 4th February, 2008

**S. O. 254.**—Whereas by notification of Government of India in Ministry of Petroleum and Natural Gas, number S.O. 2239 dated: 9th July, 2007 issued under sub-section (1) of Section 3 of the Petroleum and Minerals Pipelines (Acquisition of Right of User in Land) Act, 1962 (50 of 1962) (hereinafter referred to as the said Act), the Government of India declared its intention to acquire the Right of User in the land, specified in the Schedule appended to that notification for the purpose of laying **Kakinada-Hyderabad-Uran-Ahmedabad** gas pipeline for transportation of natural gas from the Structures in Andhra Pradesh of M/s. Reliance Industries Limited, by M/s. Reliance Gas Transportation Infrastructure Limited to various consumers of District Thane in the State of Maharashtra;

And whereas the copies of the said Notification were made available to the public on or before 30<sup>th</sup> November, 2007;

And whereas objections received from the public to the laying of the pipeline have been considered and disallowed by the Competent Authority;

And whereas the Competent Authority has under sub-section (1) of Section 6 of the said Act, has submitted his report to the Government of India;

And whereas Government of India after considering the said report and on being satisfied that the said land is required for laying pipeline, has decided to acquire the Right of User therein;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) of Section 6 of the said Act, Government of India hereby declares that the Right of User in the said land specified in the Schedule appended to this notification is hereby acquired, for laying the pipeline;

And further, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (4) of Section 6 of the said Act, Government of India hereby directs that the Right of User in the said land for laying the pipeline shall, instead of vesting in Government of India, vests, on this date of publication of the declaration, in M/s Reliance Gas Transportation Infrastructure Limited free from all encumbrances.

367 GI/08-9

**Schedule**

Mandal/Tehsil/Taluka: Kalyan		District: Thane		State : Maharashtra	
Village	Survey/ Sub-division No.	Area to be acquired for ROU			
		Hectare	Are	C-Are	
1	2	3	4	5	
1) Ankhar	34/1/1	00	01	30	
	34/1/3	00	07	00	
2) Apti	.29/1	00	10	00	
3) Guravali	.12/2	00	04	60	
	34/5A	00	04	58	
	34/5B	00	05	04	
	62/14	00	01	80	
4) Manjarli	.25/5	00	00	30	
	.31/3	00	06	10	
	31/4	00	03	02	
	.69/6	00	13	50	
	.69/10	00	20	24	
	.69/12	00	00	60	
	.69/20	00	09	90	
	.69/22	00	11	68	
5) Vaholi	.7/9	00	32	23	
	14/13	00	20	64	
	14/14	00	05	17	
	14/15	00	33	81	
	94/1	00	03	90	
	114/12	00	21	00	
6) Titwala	49/6	00	07	91	

[F. No. L-14014/42/2004-G.P.]

K. K. SHARMA, Under Secy.

नई दिल्ली, 8 फरवरी, 2008

का. आ. 255.— केन्द्रीय सरकार को यह प्रतीत होता है कि लोकहित में यह आवश्यक है कि आन्ध्रप्रदेश राज्य में चेन्नै पेट्रोलियम कॉर्पोरेशन लिमिटेड, मनाली की रिफ़ैनेरी से देवगुडि टर्मिनल, बैंगलूर तक पेट्रोलियम उत्पादनों के परिवहन के लिए इंडियन ऑयल कॉर्पोरेशन लिमिटेड द्वारा “चेन्नै-बैंगलूर पाइपलाइन” बिछाई जानी चाहिए ;

और केन्द्रीय सरकार को उक्त पाइपलाइन बिछाने के प्रयोजन के लिए यह आवश्यक प्रतीत होता है कि उस भूमि में उक्त पाइपलाइन बिछाए जाने का प्रस्ताव है और जो इस अधिसूचना से संलग्न अनुसूची में वर्णित है, उपयोग के अधिकार का अर्जन किया जाए;

अतः अब, केन्द्रीय सरकार, पेट्रोलियम और खनिज पाइपलाइन (भूमि में उपयोग के अधिकार का अर्जन) अधिनियम 1962 (1962 का 50) की धारा 3 की उप-धारा (1) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, उस भूमि में उपयोग के अधिकार का अर्जन करने के अपने आशय की घोषणा करती है ;

कोई व्यक्ति, जो उक्त अनुसूची में वर्णित भूमि में हितबद्ध है, उस तारीख से, जिसको उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 3 की उप-धारा (1) के अधिन भारत के राजपत्र में यथा प्रकाशित इस अधिसूचना की प्रतियों साधारण जनता को उपलब्ध करा दी जाती है, इक्किस दिन के भीतर उस भूमि के नीचे पाइपलाइन बिछाने के संबंध में श्री एल. वेंकटा सुब्बय्या सक्षम अधिकारी, इंडियन ऑयल कॉर्पोरेशन लिमिटेड, चेन्नै-बैंगलूर पाइपलाइन परियोजना, अपार्टमेंट सं 104, वटसला टावर्स, नाएडु बिल्डिंग्स, चित्तूर - 517 001, आन्ध्रप्रदेश को लिखित रूप में आक्षेप भेज सकेगा ।

### अनुसूची

मंडल : पालसमुद्रम		जिला : चित्तूर		राज्य : आन्ध्रप्रदेश	
गाँव का नाम	सर्वेक्षण सं- खण्ड सं.	उप-खण्ड सं.	क्षेत्रफल		
			हेक्टर	एयर	वर्ग मिटर
1	2	3	4	5	6
47, श्रीकावेरिराजुपुरम	111	8	00	00	81
	111	9	00	00	81
	111	15	00	02	83
48, पालसमुद्रम	76	9	00	01	21
49, वेंगलराजुकुप्पम	185	2	00	02	83
	148	5	00	02	83
	86	2	00	00	81
	33	8	00	08	10
50, अमुदला	265	5	00	07	29
	251	10	00	01	62
51, अमिदुला पुत्तूर	98	1	00	00	81
	98	2	00	00	81
	98	3	00	01	21
	103	2	00	00	81

[फा. सं. आर-25011/5/2007-ओ.आर.-I]

एस. के. चिटकारा, अवर सचिव

New Delhi, the 8th February, 2008

**S. O. 255.**—Whereas, it appears to the Central Government that it is necessary in the public interest that for the transportation of petroleum product from Refinery of Chennai Petroleum Corporation Limited, Manali to Devanguthi Terminal, Bangalore in the State of Andhra Pradesh, a pipeline should be laid by the Indian Oil Corporation Limited.

And whereas, it appears to the Central Government that for the purpose of laying such pipeline, it is necessary to acquire the Right of User in the land described in the Schedule annexed to this notification;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (I) of section 3 of the Petroleum and Minerals Pipeline (Acquisition of Right of User in land) Act 1962 (50 of 1962), the Central Government hereby declares its intention to acquire the Right of user therein;

Any person interested in the land described in the said Schedule may within twenty-one days from the date on which the copies of this notification, as published in the Gazette of India are made available to the general public, object in writing to the acquisition of the Right of User therein, or laying of pipeline under the land to Shri L.Venkatasubbaiah, Competent Authority, Indian Oil Corporation Limited, Chennai-Bangalore Pipeline Project, Apartment No. 104, Vatsala Towers, Naidu Buildings, Chittoor – 517001, Andhra Pradesh.

**SCHEDULE**

landal : Palasamudram		District : Chittoor		State : Andhra Pradesh	
Name of the Village	Survey No.	Sub - Division No.	Hectare	Area	Sq.Mtr.
1	2	3	4	5	6
47, Sri Kaverirajupuram	111	8	00	00	81
	111	9	00	00	81
	111	15	00	02	83
48, Palasamudram	76	9	00	01	21
49, Vengalrajukuppam	185	2	00	02	83
	148	5	00	02	83
	86	2	00	00	81
	33	8	00	08	10
50, Amudala	265	5	00	07	29
	251	10	00	01	62
51, Amudalaputtur	98	1	00	00	81
	98	2	00	00	81
	98	3	00	01	21
	103	2	00	00	81

[F. No. R-25011/5/2007-O.R.-I]

S.K. CHITKARA, Under Secy.

नई दिल्ली, 8 फरवरी, 2008

का. आ. 256.— केन्द्रीय सरकार को यह प्रतीत होता है कि लोकहित में यह आवश्यक है कि आन्ध्रप्रदेश राज्य में चेन्नै पेट्रोलियम कॉर्पोरेशन लिमिटेड, मनाली की रिफ़ैनेरी से देवगुडि टर्मिनल, बैंगलूर तक पेट्रोलियम उत्पादनों के परिवहन के लिए इंडियन ऑयल कॉर्पोरेशन लिमिटेड द्वारा “चेन्नै-बैंगलूर पाइपलाइन” बिछाई जानी चाहिए ;

और केन्द्रीय सरकार को उक्त पाइपलाइन बिछाने के प्रयोजन के लिए यह आवश्यक प्रतीत होता है कि उस भूमि में उक्त पाइपलाइन बिछाए जाने का प्रस्ताव है और जो इस अधिसूचना से संलग्न अनुसूची में वर्णित है, उपयोग के अधिकार का अर्जन किया जाए;

अतः अब, केन्द्रीय सरकार, पेट्रोलियम और खनिज पाइपलाइन (भूमि में उपयोग के अधिकार का अर्जन) अधिनियम 1962 (1962 का 50) की धारा 3 की उप-धारा (1) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, उस भूमि में उपयोग के अधिकार का अर्जन करने के अपने आशय की घोषणा करती है ;

कोई व्यक्ति, जो उक्त अनुसूची में वर्णित भूमि में हितबद्ध है, उस तारीख से, जिसको उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 3 की उप-धारा (1) के अधिन भारत के राजपत्र में यथा प्रकाशित इस अधिसूचना की प्रतियाँ साधारण जनता को उपलब्ध करा दी जाती है, इक्किस दिन के भीतर उस भूमि के नीचे पाइपलाइन बिछाने के संबंध में श्री एल. वेंकटा सुब्बय्या सक्षम अधिकारी, इंडियन ऑयल कॉर्पोरेशन लिमिटेड, चेन्नै-बैंगलूर पाइपलाइन परियोजना, अपार्टमेंट सं 104, वटसला टावर्स, नाएडु बिल्डिंग्स, चित्तूर - 517 001, आन्ध्रप्रदेश को लिखित रूप में आक्षेप भेज सकेगा ।

### अनुसूची

मंडल : चित्तूर		जिला : चित्तूर		राज्य : आन्ध्रप्रदेश	
गाँव का नाम	सर्वेक्षण सं- खण्ड सं.	उप-खण्ड सं.	क्षेत्रफल		
			हेक्टर	एयर	वर्ग मिटर
1	2	3	4	5	6
55, अनंतपुरम	212	2A	00	04	05
	177	2	00	00	81
	177	5	00	00	81
	112	9	00	02	43
	112	6	00	03	24
	114	3	00	01	21
	114	9	00	00	81
	115	7	00	00	81

1	2	3	4	5	6
57, तालांबेडु	51	5D	00	00	81
	51	5C	00	00	81
	51	8	00	01	21
	63	1	00	00	81
	63	2	00	01	21
	63	5	00	02	43
	63	6	00	02	02
	63	9	00	01	21
	63	10	00	00	81
	69	2	00	01	62
	69	1A	00	04	05
58, चिंतलगुंटा	41	11	00	01	21
60, नारिगापल्लि	257	3	00	02	02
	99	3	00	00	81
61, अनुप्पल्ले	153	7	00	00	81

[फा. सं. आर-25011/5/2007-ओ.आर.-I]

एस. के. चिटकारा, अवर सचिव

New Delhi, the 8th February, 2008

**S. O. 256.**—Whereas, it appears to the Central Government that it is necessary in the public interest that for the transportation of petroleum product from Refinery of Chennai Petroleum Corporation Limited, Manali to Devanguthi Terminal, Bangalore in the State of Andhra Pradesh, a pipeline should be laid by the Indian Oil Corporation Limited.

And whereas, it appears to the Central Government that for the purpose of laying such pipeline, it is necessary to acquire the Right of User in the land described in the Schedule annexed to this notification;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (I) of section 3 of the Petroleum and Minerals Pipeline (Acquisition of Right of User in land) Act 1962 (50 of 1962), the Central Government hereby declares its intention to acquire the Right of user therein;

Any person interested in the land described in the said Schedule may within twenty-one days from the date on which the copies of this notification, as published in the Gazette of India are made available to the general public, object in writing to the acquisition of the Right of User therein, or laying of pipeline under the land to Shri L.Venkatasubbaiah, Competent Authority, Indian Oil Corporation Limited, Chennai-Bangalore Pipeline Project, Apartment No. 104, Vatsala Towers, Naidu Buildings, Chittoor – 517001, Andhra Pradesh.

## SCHEDULE

Mandal : Chittoor		District : Chittoor		State : Andhra Pradesh	
Name of the Village	Survey No.	Sub - Division No.	Hectare	Area	Sq.Mtr.
1	2	3	4	5	6
55, Anantapuram	212	2A	00	04	05
	177	2	00	00	81
	177	5	00	00	81
	112	9	00	02	43
	112	6	00	03	24
	114	3	00	01	21
	114	9	00	00	81
	115	7	00	00	81
57, Thalambedu	51	5D	00	00	81
	51	5C	00	00	81
	51	8	00	01	21
	63	1	00	00	81
	63	2	00	01	21
	63	5	00	02	43
	63	6	00	02	02
	63	9	00	01	21
	63	10	00	00	81
	69	2	00	01	62
	69	1A	00	04	05
58, Chintala Gunta	41	11	00	01	21
60, Nariga Pale	257	3	00	02	02
	99	3	00	00	81
61, Anuppalle	153	7	00	00	81

[F. No. R-25011/5/2007-O.R.-I]

S.K. CHITKARA, Under Secy.

नई दिल्ली, 8 फरवरी, 2008

का. आ. 257.—केन्द्रीय सरकार को यह प्रतीत होता है कि लोकहित में यह आवश्यक है कि आन्ध्रप्रदेश राज्य में चेन्नै पेट्रोलियम कॉर्पोरेशन लिमिटेड, मनाली की रिफ़ैनेरी से देवनगुडि टर्मिनल, बैंगलूर तक पेट्रोलियम उत्पादों के परिवहन के लिए इंडियन ऑयल कॉर्पोरेशन लिमिटेड द्वारा “चेन्नै-बैंगलूर पाइपलाइन” बिछाई जानी चाहिए ;

और केन्द्रीय सरकार को उक्त पाइपलाइन बिछाने के प्रयोजन के लिए यह आवश्यक प्रतीत होता है कि उस भूमि में उक्त पाइपलाइन बिछाए जाने का प्रस्ताव है और जो इस अधिसूचना से संलग्न अनुसूची में वर्णित है, उपयोग के अधिकार का अर्जन किया जाए;

अतः अब, केन्द्रीय सरकार, पेट्रोलियम और खनिज पाइपलाइन (भूमि में उपयोग के अधिकार का अर्जन) अधिनियम 1962 (1962 का 50) की धारा 3 की उप-धारा (1) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, उस भूमि में उपयोग के अधिकार का अर्जन करने के अपने आशय की घोषणा करती है ;

कोई व्यक्ति, जो उक्त अनुसूची में वर्णित भूमि में हितबद्ध है, उस तारीख से, जिसको उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 3 की उप-धारा (1) के अधिन भारत के राजपत्र में यथा प्रकाशित इस अधिसूचना की प्रतियों साधारण जनता को उपलब्ध करा दी जाती है, इक्किस दिन के भीतर उस भूमि के नीचे पाइपलाइन बिछाने के संबंध में श्री एल. जैकटा सुब्बय्या सक्षम अधिकारी, इंडियन ऑयल कॉर्पोरेशन लिमिटेड, चेन्नै-बैंगलूर पाइपलाइन परियोजना, अपार्टमेंट सं 104, वटसला टावर्स, नाएडु बिल्डिंग्स, चित्तूर - 517 001, आन्ध्रप्रदेश को लिखित रूप में आक्षेप भेज सकेगा ।

### अनुसूची

मंडल : गंगावरम		जिला : चित्तूर		राज्य : आन्ध्रप्रदेश	
गाँव का नाम	सर्वेक्षण सं- खण्ड सं.	उप-खण्ड सं.	क्षेत्रफल		
			हेक्टर	एयर	वर्ग मिटर
1	2	3	4	5	6
74, गंगावरम	761	7	00	02	43
	739	3A	00	18	32
	769	3	00	04	05
75, मारेडुपल्लि	131	7A	00	00	81
	129	3	00	02	02
76, दंडपल्ले	806	1B	00	06	48
78, मामाडुगु	661	2	00	01	62
	661	4	00	01	62
	523	1	00	08	10
	523	2B	00	07	29
	523	2C	00	01	21
79, पाथिकोडा	421	3	00	05	26
	421	1	00	06	48
	312	1A	00	12	96
	150	1	00	01	62
80, कीलापल्लि	117	3	00	05	26
	91	1	00	06	07
	91	4	00	02	02

[फा. सं. आर-25011/5/2007-ओ.आर.-1]

एस. के. चिटकारा, अवर सचिव



New Delhi, the 8th February, 2008

**S. O. 257.**—Whereas, it appears to the Central Government that it is necessary in the public interest that for the transportation of petroleum product from Refinery of Chennai Petroleum Corporation Limited, Manali to Devanguthi Terminal, Bangalore in the State of Andhra Pradesh, a pipeline should be laid by the Indian Oil Corporation Limited.

And whereas, it appears to the Central Government that for the purpose of laying such pipeline, it is necessary to acquire the Right of User in the land described in the Schedule annexed to this notification;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (I) of section 3 of the Petroleum and Minerals Pipeline (Acquisition of Right of User in land) Act 1962 (50 of 1962), the Central Government hereby declares its intention to acquire the Right of user therein;

Any person interested in the land described in the said Schedule may within twenty-one days from the date on which the copies of this notification, as published in the Gazette of India are made available to the general public, object in writing to the acquisition of the Right of User therein, or laying of pipeline under the land to Shri L.Venkatasubbaiah, Competent Authority, Indian Oil Corporation Limited, Chennai-Bangalore Pipeline Project, Apartment No. 104, Vatsala Towers, Naidu Buildings, Chittoor – 517001, Andhra Pradesh.

**SCHEDULE**

Mandal :Gangavaram			District :Chittoor		State : Andhra Pradesh	
				Area		
Name of the Village	Survey No.	Sub - Division No.	Hectare	Area	Sq.Mtr.	
1	2	3	4	5	6	
74, Gangavaram	761	7	00	02	43	
	739	3A	00	18	32	
	769	3	00	04	05	
75, Maredupalli	131	7A	00	00	81	
	129	3	00	02	02	
76, Dandapalle	806	1B	00	06	48	
78, Mamdugu	661	2	00	01	62	
	661	4	00	01	62	
	523	1	00	08	10	
	523	2B	00	07	29	
	523	2C	00	01	21	

367 GI/08-11

1	2	3	4	5	6
79, Pathikonda	421	3	00	05	26
	421	1	00	06	48
	312	1A	00	12	96
	150	1	00	01	62
80, Keela Palli	117	3	00	05	26
	91	1	00	06	07
	91	4	00	02	02

[F. No. R-25011/5/2007-O.R.-1]  
S.K. CHITKARA, Under Secy.

नई दिल्ली, 8 फरवरी, 2008

का. आ. 258.—केन्द्रीय सरकार को यह प्रतीत होता है कि लोकहित में यह आवश्यक है कि आन्ध्रप्रदेश राज्य में चेन्नै पेट्रोलियम कॉर्पोरेशन लिमिटेड, मनाली की रिफ़ेनेरी से देवनगुडि टॉर्मिनल, बैंगलूर तक पेट्रोलियम उत्पादनों के परिवहन के लिए इंडियन ऑयल कॉर्पोरेशन लिमिटेड द्वारा “चेन्नै-बैंगलूर पाइपलाइन” बिछाई जानी चाहिए ;

और केन्द्रीय सरकार को उक्त पाइपलाइन बिछाने के प्रयोजन के लिए यह आवश्यक प्रतीत होता है कि उस भूमि में उक्त पाइपलाइन बिछाए जाने का प्रस्ताव है और जो इस अधिसूचना से संलग्न अनुसूची में वर्णित है, उपयोग के अधिकार का अर्जन किया जाए;

अतः अब, केन्द्रीय सरकार, पेट्रोलियम और खनिज पाइपलाइन (भूमि में उपयोग के अधिकार का अर्जन) अधिनियम 1962 (1962 का 50) की धारा 3 की उप-धारा (1) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, उस भूमि में उपयोग के अधिकार का अर्जन करने के अपने आशय की घोषणा करती है ;

कोई व्यक्ति, जो उक्त अनुसूची में वर्णित भूमि में हितबद्ध है, उस तारीख से, जिसको उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 3 की उप-धारा (1) के अधिन भारत के राजपत्र से यथा प्रकाशित इस अधिसूचना की प्रतियाँ साधारण जनता को उपलब्ध करा दी जाती है, इक्किस दिन के भीतर उस भूमि के नीचे पाइपलाइन बिछाने के संबंध में श्री एल. वेंकटा सुब्बय्या सक्षम अधिकारी, इंडियन ऑयल कॉर्पोरेशन लिमिटेड, चेन्नै-बैंगलूर पाइपलाइन परियोजना, अपार्टमेंट सं 104, वटसला टावर्स, नाएडु बिल्डिंग्स, चित्तूर - 517 001, आन्ध्रप्रदेश को लिखित रूप में आक्षेप भेज सकेगा ।

## अनुसूची

मंडल : विजयपुरम		जिला : चित्तूर		राज्य : आन्ध्रप्रदेश	
गाँव का नाम	सर्वेक्षण सं- खण्ड सं.	उप-खण्ड सं.	क्षेत्रफल		
			हेक्टर	एयर	वर्ग मिटर
1	2	3	4	5	6
28, श्रीहरिपुरम	136	15A	00	01	62
	133	19	00	02	83
	124	2	00	04	86
	124	3	00	06	07
	124	5	00	01	21
29, महाराजापुरम	47	2	00	08	10
	48	5	00	07	29
32, पाथरकोड	246	3	00	02	43
	101	1	00	00	81
	154	3A	00	07	29
	154	3B	00	08	10
	155	6	00	07	29

[फा. सं. आर-25011/5/2007-ओ.आर.-I]

एस. के. चिटकारा, अवर सचिव

New Delhi, the 8th February, 2008

S.O. 258.—Whereas, it appears to the Central Government that it is necessary in the public interest that for the transportation of petroleum product from Refinery of Chennai Petroleum Corporation Limited, Manali to Devanguthi Terminal, Bangalore in the State of Andhra Pradesh, a pipeline should be laid by the Indian Oil Corporation Limited.

And whereas, it appears to the Central Government that for the purpose of laying such pipeline, it is necessary to acquire the Right of User in the land described in the Schedule annexed to this notification;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (I) of section 3 of the Petroleum and Minerals Pipeline (Acquisition of Right of User in land) Act 1962 (50 of 1962), the Central Government hereby declares its intention to acquire the Right of user therein;

Any person interested in the land described in the said Schedule may within twenty-one days from the date on which the copies of this notification, as published in the Gazette of India are made available to the general public, object in writing to the acquisition of the Right of User therein, or laying of pipeline under the land to Shri L.Venkatasubbaiah, Competent Authority, Indian Oil Corporation Limited, Chennai-Bangalore Pipeline Project, Apartment No. 104, Vatsala Towers, Naidu Buildings, Chittoor – 517001, Andhra Pradesh.

## SCHEDULE

Mandal :Vijayapuram		District :Chittoor		State : Andhra Pradesh	
				Area	
Name of the Village	Survey No.	Sub - Division No.	Hectare	Area	Sq.Mtr.
1	2	3	4	5	6
28, Sri Hari Puram	136	15A	00	01	62
	133	19	00	02	83
	124	2	00	04	86
	124	3	00	06	07
	124	5	00	01	21
29, Maharaja Puram	47	2	00	08	10
	48	5	00	07	29
32, Pathaarcod	246	3	00	02	43
	101	1	00	00	81
	154	3A	00	07	29
	154	3B	00	08	10
	155	6	00	07	29

[F. No. R-25011/5/2007-O.R.-I]  
S.K. CHITKARA, Under Secy.

नई दिल्ली, 8 फरवरी, 2008

का. आ. 259.— केन्द्रीय सरकार को यह प्रतीत होता है कि लोकहित में यह आवश्यक है कि आन्ध्रप्रदेश राज्य में चेन्नै पेट्रोलियम कॉर्पोरेशन लिमिटेड, मनाली की रिफ़ाइनरी से देवगुडि टर्मिनल, बैंगलूर तक पेट्रोलियम उत्पादों के परिवहन के लिए इंडियन ऑयल कॉर्पोरेशन लिमिटेड द्वारा “चेन्नै-बैंगलूर पाइपलाइन” बिछाई जानी चाहिए ;

और केन्द्रीय सरकार को उक्त पाइपलाइन बिछाने के प्रयोजन के लिए यह आवश्यक प्रतीत होता है कि उस भूमि में उक्त पाइपलाइन बिछाए जाने का प्रस्ताव है और जो इस अधिसूचना से संलग्न अनुसूची में वर्णित है, उपयोग के अधिकार का अर्जन किया जाए;

अतः अब, केन्द्रीय सरकार, पेट्रोलियम और खनिज पाइपलाइन (भूमि में उपयोग के अधिकार का अर्जन) अधिनियम 1962 (1962 का 50) की धारा 3 की उप-धारा (1) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, उस भूमि में उपयोग के अधिकार का अर्जन करने के अपने आशय की घोषणा करती है ;

कोई व्यक्ति, जो उक्त अनुसूची में वर्णित भूमि में हितबद्ध है, उस तारीख से, जिसको उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 3 की उप-धारा (1) के अधिन भारत के राजपत्र में यथा प्रकाशित इस अधिसूचना की प्रतियाँ साधारण जनता को उपलब्ध करा दी जाती है, इक्किस दिन के भीतर उस भूमि के नीचे पाइपलाइन बिछाने के संबंध में श्री एल. वेंकटा सुब्बय्या सक्षम अधिकारी, इंडियन ऑयल कॉर्पोरेशन लिमिटेड, चेन्नै-बैंगलूर पाइपलाइन परियोजना, अर्पाटमेंट सं 104, वटसला टावर्स, नाएडु बिल्डिंग्स, चित्तूर - 517 001, आन्ध्रप्रदेश को लिखित रूप में आक्षेप भेज सकेगा ।

## अनुसूची

मंडल : बैरेडीपल्लि		जिला : चित्तूर		राज्य : आन्ध्रप्रदेश	
गाँव का नाम	सर्वेक्षण सं- खण्ड सं.	उप-खण्ड सं.	क्षेत्रफल		
			हेक्टर	एयर	वर्ग मिटर
1	2	3	4	5	6
83, गोल्लाचीमनापल्लि	65	1	00	01	21
84, आलापल्लि	269	1	00	06	07

[फा. सं. आर-25011/5/2007-ओ.आर.-1]

एस. के. चिटकारा, अवर सचिव

New Delhi, the 8th February, 2008

S. O. 259.— Whereas, it appears to the Central Government that it is necessary in the public interest that for the transportation of petroleum product from Refinery of Chennai Petroleum Corporation Limited, Manali to Devanguthi Terminal, Bangalore in the State of Andhra Pradesh, a pipeline should be laid by the Indian Oil Corporation Limited.

And whereas, it appears to the Central Government that for the purpose of laying such pipeline, it is necessary to acquire the Right of User in the land described in the Schedule annexed to this notification;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) of section 3 of the Petroleum and Minerals Pipeline (Acquisition of Right of User in land) Act 1962 (50 of 1962), the Central Government hereby declares its intention to acquire the Right of user therein;

Any person interested in the land described in the said Schedule may within twenty-one days from the date on which the copies of this notification, as published in the Gazette of India are made available to the general public, object in writing to the acquisition of the Right of User therein, or laying of pipeline under the land to Shri L.Venkatasubbaiah, Competent Authority, Indian Oil Corporation Limited, Chennai-Bangalore Pipeline Project, Apartment No. 104, Vatsala Towers, Naidu Buildings, Chittoor – 517001, Andhra Pradesh.

367 GI/08-12

**SCHEDULE**

Mandal : Baireddypalli		District : Chittoor		State : Andhra Pradesh	
Name of the Village	Survey No.	Sub-Division No.	Area		
			Hectare	Are	Sq. Mtr.
1	2	3	4	5	6
83, Gollacheemanapalle	65	1	00	01	21
84, Alapalle	269	1	00	06	07

[F. No. R-25011/5/2007-O.R.-I]  
S.K. CHITKARA, Under Secy.

नई दिल्ली, 8 फरवरी, 2008

का. आ. 260.— केन्द्रीय सरकार को यह प्रतीत होता है कि लोकहित में यह आवश्यक है कि आन्ध्रप्रदेश राज्य में चेन्नै पेट्रोलियम कॉर्पोरेशन लिमिटेड, मनाली की रिफ़ैनेरी से देवनगुडि टर्मिनल, बैंगलुर तक पेट्रोलियम उत्पादों के परिवहन के लिए इंडियन ऑयल कॉर्पोरेशन लिमिटेड द्वारा “चेन्नै-बैंगलुर पाइपलाइन” बिछाई जानी चाहिए ;

और केन्द्रीय सरकार को उक्त पाइपलाइन बिछाने के प्रयोजन के लिए यह आवश्यक प्रतीत होता है कि उस भूमि में उक्त पाइपलाइन बिछाए जाने का प्रस्ताव है और जो इस अधिसूचना से संलग्न अनुसूची में वर्णित है, उपयोग के अधिकार का अर्जन किया जाए;

अतः अब, केन्द्रीय सरकार, पेट्रोलियम और खनिज पाइपलाइन (भूमि में उपयोग के अधिकार का अर्जन) अधिनियम 1962 (1962 का 50) की धारा 3 की उप-धारा (1) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, उस भूमि में उपयोग के अधिकार का अर्जन करने के अपने आशय की घोषणा करती है ;

कोई व्यक्ति, जो उक्त अनुसूची में वर्णित भूमि में हितबद्ध है, उस तारीख से, जिसको उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 3 की उप-धारा (1) के अधिन भारत के राजपत्र में यथा प्रकाशित इस अधिसूचना की प्रतियों साधारण जनता को उपलब्ध करा दी जाती है, इक्किस दिन के भीतर उस भूमि के नीचे पाइपलाइन बिछाने के संबंध में श्री एल. वेंकटा सुब्बय्या सक्षम अधिकारी, इंडियन ऑयल कॉर्पोरेशन लिमिटेड, चेन्नै-बैंगलुर पाइपलाइन परियोजना, अपार्टमेंट सं 104, वटसला टावर्स, नाएडु बिल्डिंग्स, चित्तूर - 517 001, आन्ध्रप्रदेश को लिखित रूप में आक्षेप भेज सकेगा ।

## अनुसूची

मंडल : बंगारुपालेम		जिला : चित्तूर		राज्य : आन्ध्रप्रदेश	
गाँव का नाम	सर्वेक्षण सं- खण्ड सं.	उप-खण्ड सं.	क्षेत्रफल		
			हेक्टर	एयर	वर्ग मिटर
1	2	3	4	5	6
69, जंबुवरिपल्लि	103	2	00	01	62
	99	1	00	02	83
70, गोत्लापल्ले	90	6	00	02	02
	90	8	00	01	21
	147	1	00	10	12
72, मोगिलि	173	2	00	02	02
	172	2	00	03	24
	99	2	00	04	05
	48	1	00	09	31
	146	5	00	02	02
	48	4	00	08	10
	51	4	00	11	34

[फा. सं. आर-25011/5/2007-ओ.आर.-I]

एस. के. चिटकारा, अवर सचिव

New Delhi, the 8th February, 2008

S.O. 260.—Whereas, it appears to the Central Government that it is necessary in the public interest that for the transportation of petroleum product from Refinery of Chennai Petroleum Corporation Limited, Manali to Devanguthi Terminal, Bangalore in the State of Andhra Pradesh, a pipeline should be laid by the Indian Oil Corporation Limited.

And whereas, it appears to the Central Government that for the purpose of laying such pipeline, it is necessary to acquire the Right of User in the land described in the Schedule annexed to this notification;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) of section 3 of the Petroleum and Minerals Pipeline (Acquisition of Right of User in land) Act 1962 (50 of 1962), the Central Government hereby declares its intention to acquire the Right of user therein;

Any person interested in the land described in the said Schedule may within twenty-one days from the date on which the copies of this notification, as published in the Gazette of India are made available to the general public, object in writing to the acquisition of the Right of User therein, or laying of pipeline under the land to Shri L.Venkatasubbaiah, Competent Authority, Indian Oil Corporation Limited, Chennai-Bangalore Pipeline Project, Apartment No. 104, Vatsala Towers, Naidu Buildings, Chittoor - 517001, Andhra Pradesh.

**SCHEDULE**

Mandal :Bangarupalyam		District : Chittoor		State : Andhra Pradesh	
Name of the Village	Survey No.	Sub-Division No.	Area		
			Hectare	Are	Sq. Mtr.
1	2	3	4	5	6
69 ,Jambuvvari Palli	103	2	00	01	62
	99	1	00	02	83
70, Gollapalle	90	6	00	02	02
	90	8	00	01	21
	147	1	00	10	12
72, Mogili	173	2	00	02	02
	172	2	00	03	24
	99	2	00	04	05
	48	1	00	09	31
	146	5	00	02	02
	48	4	00	08	10
	51	4	00	11	34

[F. No. R-25011/5/2007-O.R.-I]

S.K. CHITKARA, Under Secy.

नई दिल्ली, 8 फरवरी, 2008

का. आ. 261.—केन्द्रीय सरकार को यह प्रतीत होता है कि लोकहित में यह आवश्यक है कि चेन्नै पेट्रोलियम कॉर्पोरेशन लिमिटेड, मनाली की रिफ़ाइनरी से देवनगुट्टि टॉर्मिनल, बैंगलूर तक पेट्रोलियम उत्पादनों के परिवहन के लिए इंडियन ऑयल कॉर्पोरेशन लिमिटेड द्वारा “चेन्नै- बैंगलूर पाइपलाइन” बिछाई जानी चाहिए ;

और केन्द्रीय सरकार को उक्त पाइपलाइन बिछाने के प्रयोजन के लिए यह आवश्यक प्रतीत होता है कि उस भूमि में उक्त पाइपलाइन बिछाए जाने का प्रस्ताव है और जो इस अधिसूचना से संलग्न अनुसूची में वर्णित है, उपयोग के अधिकार का अर्जन किया जाए;

अतः अब, केन्द्रीय सरकार, पेट्रोलियम और खनिज पाइपलाइन (भूमि में उपयोग के अधिकार का अर्जन) अधिनियम 1962 (1962 का 50) की धारा 3 की उप-धारा (1) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, उस भूमि में उपयोग के अधिकार का अर्जन करने के अपने आशय की घोषणा करती है ;

कोई व्यक्ति, जो उक्त अनुसूची में वर्णित भूमि में हितबद्ध है, उस तारीख से, जिसको उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 3 की उप-धारा (1) के अधिन भारत के राजपत्र में यथा प्रकाशित इस अधिसूचना की प्रतियाँ साधारण जनता को उपलब्ध करा दी जाती हैं, इक्किस दिन के भीतर उस भूमि के नीचे पाइपलाइन बिछाने के संबंध में श्री, ऐल. जे. कटा सुब्बय्या , सक्षम प्राधिकारी, इंडियन ऑयल कॉर्पोरेशन लिमिटेड, चेन्नै-बैंगलूर पाइपलाइन परियोजना, अपार्टमेंट सं 104, वटसला टावर्स, नाएडु बिल्डिंग्स, चित्तूर - 517 001, आन्ध्रप्रदेश को लिखित रूप में आक्षेप भेज सकेगा ।



## अनुसूची

मंडल : यादामारि		जिला : चित्तूर		राज्य : आन्ध्रप्रदेश	
गाँव का नाम	सर्वेक्षण सं- खण्ड सं.	उप-खण्ड सं.	क्षेत्रफल		
			हेक्टर	एयर	वर्ग मिटर
1	2	3	4	5	6
64, पेरियांबाडि	246	1A	00	04	86
	246	1C	00	01	62
	246	1E	00	03	64
	243	3	00	02	02
	242	4	00	01	62
	237	1	00	14	02
66, बुडिटिरेडिपल्ले	76	3	00	04	86
	41	7	00	02	02
	42	5	00	04	05
65, यादामारि	129	8	00	11	50
	129	9	00	09	50
	129	10	00	03	00
	129	11	00	04	50
	129	12	00	11	50
	130	16	00	01	50
	130	17	00	09	50
	130	18	00	16	50
	130	19	00	04	50
	130	20	00	04	50
	130	21	00	01	50
	130	22	00	18	50
	133	-	00	03	00
	131	-	00	03	50

[फा. सं. आर-25011/5/2007-ओ.आर.-I]

एस. के. चिटकारा, अवर सचिव

New Delhi, the 8th February, 2008

S. O. 261.—Whereas, it appears to the Central Government that it is necessary in the public interest that for the transportation of petroleum product from Refinery of Chennai Petroleum Corporation Limited, Manali to Devanguthi Terminal, Bangalore, a pipeline should be laid by the Indian Oil Corporation Limited.

And whereas, it appears to the Central Government that for the purpose of laying such pipeline, it is necessary to acquire the Right of User in the land described in the Schedule annexed to this notification;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (I) of section 3 of the Petroleum and Minerals Pipeline (Acquisition of Right of User

in land) Act 1962 (50 of 1962), the Central Government hereby declares its intention to acquire the right of user therein;

Any person interested in the land described in the said Schedule may within twenty-one days from the date on which the copies of this notification issued under sub-section (1) of Section 3 of the said Act, as published in the Gazette of India are made available to the general public, object in writing to the acquisition of the Right of User therein, or laying of the pipeline under the land to Sri L. Venkata Subbaiah, Competent Authority, Indian Oil Corporation Limited, Chennai-Bangalore Pipeline Project, Apartment No. 104, Vatsala Towers, Naidu Buildings, Chittoor – 517 001, Andhra Pradesh.

#### SCHEDULE

Mandal :Yadamari		District : Chittoor		State : Andhra Pradesh	
Name of the Village	Survey No.	Sub-Division No.	Area		
			Hectare	Are	Sq. Mtr.
1	2	3	4	5	6
64 ,Pereyambadi	246	1A	00	04	86
	246	1C	00	01	62
	246	1E	00	03	64
	243	3	00	02	02
	242	4	00	01	62
	237	1	00	14	02
66 ,Budithireddi Palle	76	3	00	04	86
	41	7	00	02	02
	42	5	00	04	05
65, Yadamari	129	8	00	11	50
	129	9	00	09	50
	129	10	00	03	00
	129	11	00	04	50
	129	12	00	11	50
	130	16	00	01	50
	130	17	00	09	50
	130	18	00	16	50
	130	19	00	04	50
	130	20	00	04	50
	130	21	00	01	50
	130	22	00	18	50
	133	-	00	03	00
	131	-	00	03	50

[F. No. R-25011/5/2007-O.R.-I]

S.K. CHITKARA, Under Secy.

**श्रम एवं रोजगार मंत्रालय**

नई दिल्ली, 16 जनवरी, 2008

का. आ. 262.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार नार्थन रेलवे के प्रबंधन के संबद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच, अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण कानपुर के पंचाट (संदर्भ संख्या 36/2000) को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 16-1-08 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं. एल.- 41012/272/1999-आई. आर. (बी-I)]

अजय कुमार, डेस्क अधिकारी

**MINISTRY OF LABOUR AND EMPLOYMENT**

New Delhi, the 16th January, 2008

S. O. 262.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the award (Ref. No. 36/2000) of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal/Labour Court, Kanpur as shown in the Annexure in the Industrial Dispute between the management of Northern Railways, and their workmen, which was received by the Central Government on 16-1-08.

[No. L-41012/272/1999-IR(B-1)]

AJAY KUMAR, Desk Officer

**ANNEXURE**

**BEFORE SHRI R. G. SHUKLA PRESIDING OFFICER,  
CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL  
CUM-LABOUR COURT, KANPUR**

**Industrial Dispute No. 36 of 2000**

Sri Tribhuan Nath Tiwari  
R/o 4-A Near Panki Rly. Station  
Kachchi Basti Kanpur  
AND  
The Divisional Rly. Manager  
Northern Railway  
Allahabad.

**AWARD**

1. Central Government, MOL, New Delhi, vide notification No. L-41012/272/99 (IR B-1) dated 17-2-2000, has referred the following dispute for adjudication to the tribunal:-

“Whether the action of the management of D.R.M. Northern Railway, Allahabad in not reappointing Sri Tribhuan Nath Tewari, is legal and justified? If not what relief is the disputant entitled?”

2. A careful perusal of the schedule of reference order would go to show that the point referred by the Ministry for adjudication to this tribunal is not an Industrial Dispute within the meaning of section 2-A of Industrial Disputes Act, 1947, therefore, provisions of Industrial Disputes Act, 1947, cannot be invoked in the present case for deciding the controversy. Word reappointing

appearing in the schedule of reference order cannot be construed to mean ‘Retrenchment’ within the meaning of section 2 (oo) of Industrial Disputes Act, 1947. When it is not a case of retrenchment no fruitful purpose would be served to enter into the merit of the case. It may also be pointed out that from the above it is quite obvious that there exist no valid industrial dispute between the contesting parties and if it is so tribunal is not inclined to enter into the merits of the case.

3. For the reasons discussed above and also once having concluded that there is no valid industrial dispute between the parties, alleged claimant cannot be granted any relief as claimed by him in his statement of claim. Reference, therefore, is bound to be answered against the alleged workman and in favour of the opposite party. It is, therefore, held that no relief can be granted to the alleged workman under the provisions of Industrial Disputes Act, 1947. Reference therefore is decided accordingly.

R. G. SHUKLA, Presiding Officer

नई दिल्ली, 16 जनवरी, 2008

का. आ. 263.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार सेन्ट्रल बैंक ऑफ इंडिया के प्रबंधन के संबद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच, अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण/श्रम न्यायालय कानपुर के पंचाट (संदर्भ संख्या 138/97) को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 15-1-08 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं. एल.- 12012/290/1996-आई. आर. (बी-II)]

राजिन्द्र कुमार, डेस्क अधिकारी

New Delhi, the 16th January, 2008

S. O. 263.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the award (Ref. No. 138/97) of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal/Labour Court, Kanpur as shown in the Annexure in the Industrial Dispute between the employers in relation to the management of Central Bank of India and their workmen, received by the Central Government on 15-1-08.

[No. L-12012/290/1996-IR(B-II)]

RAJINDER KUMAR, Desk Officer

**ANNEXURE**

**BEFORE SHRI R. G. SHUKLA PRESIDING  
OFFICER, CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL  
TRIBUNAL-CUM-LABOUR COURT, KANPUR**

**Industrial Dispute No. 138 of 97**

In the matter of dispute between:

Sh. Raj Nath S/o Ram Dhari Singh  
Mohalla Sujawalpur Mahuabagh  
Ghazipur, Uttar Pradesh.

AND

The Regional Manager  
Central Bank of India  
Lanka Varanasi.

### AWARD

1. Central Government, MOL, New Delhi, vide notification No. L-12012/290/96/IR B-II dated 14-8-97, has referred the following dispute for adjudication to this tribunal:-

“Whether Sri Raj Nath son of Sri Ramdhari Ram has actually worked for 240 days or more as casual worker at Central Bank of India Mahuabagh Ghazipur branch during preceding 12 months from 16-9-92 ? If so whether the action of the management of Central Bank of India in terminating the services of Sri Raj Nath w.e.f. 17-9-92 without following the provisions of section 25 F of I. D. Act, 1947 is legal and justified? If not to what relief the said workman is entitled?

2. It is common ground that the workman was engaged by the opposite party on casual basis and was paid on daily rate through vouchers. The claim of the workman is that the opposite party bank in order to deprive the workman from attaining the regular and permanent status started a device of engaging persons on daily/casual basis for utilizing their services to complete the regular and permanent nature of work. It has also been claimed by the workman that he was engaged in the above capacity by the opposite party bank on 1-5-88 and continued to work continuously upto 16-9-92 when the opposite party bank w.e.f. 17-9-92 without any cogent reasons stopped taking work from the workman which amounts to retrenchment. The opposite party bank even did not comply with the provisions of Section 25F in as much as opposite party bank did not offer the applicant notice, notice pay or retrenchment compensation at the time of dispensation of his services. Even the management allowed juniors in their service for performing the same job and thus has violated the provisions of section 25G and as he was not offered any opportunity of reemployment, the management has further breached the provisions of section 25H of I.D. Act. Apart from the breach of above provisions of the I. D. Act, it has also been pleaded by the workman that management has not followed the Rules 76, 77 and 78 of I. D. (Central) Rules, 1957. Workman has also pleaded breach of certain provisions of Bipartite Settlement claiming himself to be the temporary employee of the opposite party bank. On the basis of above allegations it has been further stated that since the workman has worked continuously for a period of 240 days preceding 12 months from the dated of his termination, and since the opposite party has flouted mandatory provisions of the Act, he may be reinstated in the service of the opposite party bank with full wages continuity of service and all consequential benefits.

3. The claim of the workman has been refuted by the opposite party bank on a number of grounds but the tribunal

do not feel it expedient in the interest of justice to details them as the reference is going to be answered against the workman.

4. Heard the arguments of the parties and have perused the record carefully. A bare perusal of the order sheet and entire file would go to indicate that the workman failed to adduce his evidence in support of his claim. It is settled principle of law as to who will fail if no evidence is on record normal question will be that the claimant shall fail if no evidence is on record from his side to substantiate the claim. From this point of view the workman cannot be held entitled for any relief. Even otherwise when it is the own case of the workman that he was engaged as a daily rated casual worker by the opposite party bank he cannot be held employee within a meaning of workman as defined under Section 2(s) of the Act. It has not been established by the workman that at any point of time he remained in continuous employment of the bank within the meaning of Section 25 B of the Act, therefore, he cannot be allowed any protection under the provisions of the I. D. Act.

5. There is yet another aspect of the matter which fails the claim of the applicant that is now it is settled legal position that a daily rated employ, casual employee, temporary or adhoc employee has got no right to claim reinstatement in the service of public employment unless he is subjected to regular selection process and has cleared the same. Even working for more than 240 days under I. D. Act, 1947, would not entitle him to claim any right regarding public employment. So from this point of view he cannot be held entitled for any kind of relief as claimed by him in his statement of claim. Accordingly it is held that he is not entitled for any relief.

6. Reference is answered against the workman and in favour of the opposite party Central Bank of India.

R. G. SHUKLA, Presiding Officer

नई दिल्ली, 16 जनवरी, 2008

का. आ. 264.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार यूको बैंक के प्रबंधन के संबद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच, अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार/श्रम न्यायालय औद्योगिक अधिकरण कानपुर के पंचाट (संदर्भ संख्या 55/98) को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 15-1-08 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं. एल.-12012/374/1997- आई आर (बी-11)]

राजिन्द्र कुमार, डेस्क अधिकारी

New Delhi, the 16th January, 2008

S. O. 264.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the award (Ref. No. 55/98) of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal/Labour Court, Kanpur as shown in the Annexure in the Industrial

Dispute between the management of Uco Bank and their workman, received by the Central Government on 15-1-08.

[No. L-12012/374/1997-IR(B-II)]

RAJINDER KUMAR, Desk Officer

**ANNEXURE**

**BEFORE SHRI R. G. SHUKLA-PRESIDING  
OFFICER, CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL-  
TRIBUNAL-CUM-LABOUR COURT, SHRAM  
BHAWAN, A. T. I. CAMPUS, KANPUR**

**Industrial Dispute No. 55 of 1998**

**In the matter of dispute between :**

The Vice President,  
UCO Bank Staff Association,  
Allahabad

**AND**

The Zonal Manager,  
UCO Bank,  
23, Vidhan Sabha Marg, Lucknow

**AWARD**

1. Central Government, MOL, New Delhi, Vide notification No. L-12012/374/97-1. R. B-II, dated 31-3-98 has referred the following dispute for adjudication to this Tribunal:—

“Whether the action of the management of UCO Bank in terminating the services of Sru Gappu w.e.f. 5-5-97 is legal and justified? If not to what relief the said workman is entitled?”

2. The case of the workman in short is that he was engaged by the opposite party bank at its Civil Lines Branch at Allahabad on 7-9-92 as temporary peon. He was utilized to work for full banking hours and was also performing the regular and permanent nature of work of a peon. During the course of his employment he made repeated representations to the higher officer of the bank but all in vain. The workman received no response and ultimately the opposite party bank removed his services abruptly w.e.f. 5-5-97 without following the provisions of Section 25F of I.D. Act. It has also been pleaded by the workman that he completed more than 240 days of continuous service as peon still the opposite party bank without paying notice pay or retrenchment compensation has dispensed his services in breach of provisions of I.D. Act. On the basis of above allegations it has been prayed by the workman that he be reinstated in the service of the opposite party bank with full back wages, continuity of services and all consequential benefits.

3. On the contrary the claim of the workman has been denied by the opposite party bank on variety of grounds.

4. It may be pointed out that the authorised representative after exchange of pleadings between the parties has made an endorsement of order sheet dated 23-4-04 to the effect that workman will not adduce any evidence in

support of his claim. Thereafter management adduced their evidence by examining Shri Roop Narain its officer (retired).

5. In view of above it is quite clear that it is a case where virtually no evidence is available on record from the side of the claimant and, therefore, it is deemed proper to ignore the evidence of the management for its further discussion in detail by the Tribunal.

6. It is settled principle of law that plaintiff will fail if no evidence is available from his side before the court applying the same principle to the facts and circumstances of the case, since the workman has failed to adduce his evidence in support of his claim, he cannot be held entitled for any relief as claimed by him, and his claim is liable to be rejected and is rejected accordingly.

7. In view of foregoing discussions it is held that the claimant is not entitled for any relief as claimed by him in his claim statement and the reference is liable to be decided in favour of the opposite party and against the workman. Accordingly the claim is decided against the workman holding that he is not entitled for any relief.

R. G. SHUKLA, Presiding Officer

नई दिल्ली, 16 जनवरी, 2008

का. आ. 265.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार, पंजाब नेशनल बैंक के प्रबंधन के संबद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच, अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में औद्योगिक अधिकरण/श्रम न्यायालय, कानपुर के पंचाट (संदर्भ संख्या 19/97) को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 15-1-08 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं. एल.-12012/386/1995-आई आर. (बी-II)]

राजेन्द्र कुमार, डेस्क अधिकारी

New Delhi, the 16th January, 2008

S. O. 265.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the Award (Ref. No. 19/97) of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal-cum-Labour Court, Kanpur as shown in the Annexure in the Industrial Dispute between the employers in relation to the management of Punjab National Bank and their workman, which was received by the Central Government on 15-1-08.

[No. L-12012/386/1995-IR(B-II)]

RAJINDER KUMAR, Desk Officer

**ANNEXURE**

**BEFORE SHRI R. G. SHUKLA PRESIDING OFFICER  
CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL,  
CUM-LABOUR COURT, SHRAM BHAWAN, A T I  
CAMPUS, UDYOG NAGAR, KANPUR.**

**Industrial Dispute No. 19 of 1997**

**In the matter of dispute between :**

Zila Sachiv, Punjab National Bank Employees  
Union, 1115 Delhi Darwaja, Faizabad.

367 GI/08-14

*Versus*

Regional Manager,  
Punjab National Bank,  
Regional Office, Faizabad.

### AWARD

1. Central Government, MOL, New Delhi, vide notification No. L-12012/386/95-IR B-II dated 7-1-97, has referred the following dispute for adjudication to this Tribunal :-

“Whether the action of the management of Punjab National Bank, Faizabad not to give full pay and allowances to Shri O. P. Ojha after completion of one year of suspension on 21-1-94 onwards as per bank's head office circular No. 805, dated 5-11-94 in legal and justified? It not to what relief is the said workman entitled?”

2. It is unnecessary to give full details of the case as after exchange of pleadings between the parties the workman failed to adduce his evidence as a result of which he was debarred from adducing his evidence in the case vide order dated 17-4-2001 of the Tribunal and thereafter the management has adduced their evidence in support of their claim. The management has thus proved their case against the workman.

3. As workman has failed to substantiate his claim by adducing evidence in support of his claim, he cannot be held entitled for any relief claimed in his claim statement and, accordingly, his claim is liable to be rejected.

4. Accordingly, it is held that the workman is not entitled for any relief as he failed to prove his case before the Tribunal, therefore, the reference is answered against him.

R. G. SHUKLA, Presiding Officer

नई दिल्ली, 16 जनवरी, 2008

का. आ. 266.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार नहवा शेवा केन्द्रीय इंटरनेशनल कन्टेनर टर्मिनल लिमिटेड के प्रबंधन के संबंध में नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच, अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में औद्योगिक अधिकरण/श्रम न्यायालय सं०-2, मुम्बई के पंचाट (संदर्भ संख्या सीजीआईटी-2/59/2002) को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 16-1-2008 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं. एल.-31011/5/2002-आई. आर. (एम)]

एन. एस. बोरा, डेस्क अधिकारी

New Delhi, the 16th January, 2008

S. O. 266.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the award (Ref. No. CGIT-2/59/2002) of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal/Labour Court No 2, Mumbai now as shown in the Annexure in the Industrial Dispute between the employers in relation to the management of Nhava Sheva International Container

Terminal Ltd. and their workman, which was received by the Central Government on 16-1-08.

[No. L-31011/5/2002-IR(M)]

N. S. BORA, Desk Officer

### ANNEXURE

#### BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL NO. 2, MUMBAI.

PRESENT A.A. Lad, Presiding Officer

Reference No. CGIT-2/59 of 2002

Employers in relation to the management of Nhava Sheva International Container Terminal Ltd.  
The Chief Executive Officer,  
Nhava Sheva International Container Terminal Ltd.,  
Operation Centre  
Sheva, Navi Mumbai 400707.

#### AND

Their workmen  
The Vice President,  
Nhava Sheva Port & General Workers' Union,  
Port Trust Kamgar Sadan,  
Nawab Tank Road,  
Mazgaon  
Mumbai-400010.

### APPEARANCES

For the Employer : Mr. R.S. Pai  
Advocate

For the Workmen : Mr. Jaiprakash Sawant,  
Representative

Date of reserving Award : 12th April, 2007

Date of passing of Award : 13th August, 2007

### AWARD PART-I

The matrix of the facts as culled out from the proceedings are as under :

The reference is sent to this Tribunal by the Under Secretary of Central Government. The Government of India, Ministry of Labour by its Order No. L-31011/5/2002 (IR)(M) dated 16th July, 2002 in exercise of the powers conferred by Clause (d) of sub-section (1) and sub-section 2(a) of Section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 to decide :

“Whether the action of the management of Nhava Sheva International Container Terminal Ltd. in terminating the services of Shri Sameer Pandit, Ex-QC Operator w.e.f. 16-8-2001 is legal and justified? If not, to what relief the workman is entitled to?”

2. To support the subject-matter involved in the reference, 2nd Party filed Statement of Claim at Exhibit 5 stating and contending that, the action of the Management in dismissing the concerned workman from services with effect from 16th August, 2001 by its order dated 16-1-2001 is illegal and unjustified. It is stated that, the action of the

Management is against the provisions of Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 and it amounts to unfair labour practice within the meaning of Item 5(a)(b)(d)(f) and (g) of Vth Schedule of Industrial Disputes Act, 1947. It is stated that, the provisions of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 were not followed while instituting and conducting the enquiry. Even provisions of Industrial Employment (Standing Orders) Act, 1946 were not followed by framing charge and investing the charges levelled against the concerned Workman. Besides it is stated that, the finding of the Enquiry Officer is perverse and punishment awarded is disproportionate. So it is prayed that, the enquiry conducted be set aside observing not fair and proper besides finding perverse. It is also prayed that, the action taken against the concerned Workman for such an enquiry be quashed and set aside.

3. These contentions are disputed by the 1st Party by filing Written Statement at Exhibit 6 stating that, full opportunity was given to the concerned Workman. It is stated that, the representative of the 2nd Party who is also an Advocate participated in the enquiry. Witnesses were examined and the witnesses examined by the Management were made available in the enquiry to the Defence Representative. Full opportunity was given to the concerned Workman. Documents were given. Enquiry Officer had given reason and observe the charges are proved against the concerned Workman. It is stated that enquiry was fair, proper and finding not perverse. It is also stated that, the punishment awarded to the concerned Workman does not require to be disturbed. So it is prayed that, the Reference be rejected.

4. In view of the above pleadings my Ld. Predecessor framed Issues at Exhibit 7 out of which Issue Nos. 1 and 2 are framed on the point of fairness of the enquiry and perversity of the finding which are answered as follows :

<u>ISSUES</u>	<u>FINDINGS</u>
1. Whether the domestic inquiry conducted against the workman was as per the principles of natural justice?	YES
2. Whether the findings of the enquiry officer are perverse?	NO

#### REASONS

Issue Nos 1 & 2:

5. The concerned Workman was issued charge sheet dated 30th November, 2000 on the allegations like (i) willful insubordination or disobedience, whether alone or in combination with others, to any lawful and reasonable order of a superior; (ii) riotous or disorderly behaviour during working hours at the establishment or any act subversive or discipline; (iii) incite others or workmen to refuse to work in contravention of the provisions of any law or rule having force of law; refuse to accept the suspension order on 15-11-2002 and sexual harassment of woman employee at workplace.

6. After issuance of the charge sheet, and after receiving explanation of the concerned Workman, Enquiry Officer was appointed. The concerned Workman fully participated in the enquiry and the Enquiry Officer permitted him to be defended through an Advocate and he was permitted to be represented through his Defence Representative who is an Advocate. The Enquiry Officer took lenient view vis-a-vis legal practitioner was allowed to cross-examine the witnesses and those were made available who were cross-examined by the concerned Workman and the finding given is on the basis of the evidence recorded.

7. The prove enquiry not fair and proper, and the finding perverse, it is pertinent to note that, the concerned Workman did not lead any evidence. Even at this stage and stepped into witness box. Even 1st Party also chose not to lead any evidence.

8. 2nd Party filed written arguments at Exhibit 11 whereas 1st Party at Exhibit 12 with some citations.

9. After going through the pleadings and written arguments which are on the record, I find in the arguments, it is stated by the 2nd Party that, the enquiry was not fair and proper and proper opportunity was not given. It is also stated that, finding is perverse. However, it is not pointed out how enquiry is not fair and proper and why finding should be observed perverse and in fact opportunity was available to the 2nd Party to call the witnesses. Even at this stage no such steps were taken and effort is not made to prove the inquiry not fair and proper. Besides he did not utter a single word as well as tried to pin down the Management on this point to lead to conclude how inquiry was not fair. It is to be noted that, nothing is pointed out to observe Enquiry Officer was bias. Even it is not pointed out how enquiry is not fair and proper.

10. Much is made about the standing orders and charges levelled against the concerned Workman. It is to be noted that, the charge of willful insubordination or willful disobedience of lawful and reasonable orders of the superiors; riotous, disorderly and indecent behaviour on the workplace, abetting inciting, instigating others to stop work are levelled against the concerned workman. Besides charge of sexual harassment of women employees at workplace which is rather serious offence for which he was prosecuted is also levelled against him.

11. Here I fail to understand, why concerned workman was shy and did not lead any evidence on the charges levelled against him by the first party? Even 2nd Party has not called any witness in the Court to point out how enquiry can be observed not fair and proper. It is not pointed out how the enquiry can be observed not fair and proper. It is not pointed out, how the finding of the Enquiry Officer is perverse and how the enquiry was not conducted properly? He relied on a number of citations more precisely citation published in 1995 II CLR page 548 (J. Dhanraj v Tamil Nadu Electricity Board & Ors.) where it is observed

by Madras High Court that, if the act is not enumerated in Standing Orders as "act of misconduct" then against that, such a Workman cannot be charge sheeted. By this concerned Workman wants to point out that, the charge of sexual harassment to women employee at work place was not covering under the Standing Orders. There were no such Standing Orders which shows, enquiry which was conducted was not on the basis of the Standing Orders which does not enumerate such misconduct and as such, the charge of sexual harassment to women employee at workplace cannot be tried against the concerned Workman. Beside relying on the said citation concerned Workman ought to have pointed out which are the Standing Orders under which enquiry is conducted and how it is not applicable and only a general statement is made by the Advocate of the 2nd Party Workman who represented the concerned Workman in the enquiry also. Citation published in 2001 II CLR page 930 (Anil B. Joshi vs Air India Ltd. & Anr.) was on the point of Appellated Authority acting as Competent Authority who can punish the employee. Also on this point, no details are given and not pointed out how the action taken by the 1st Party was illegal or was taken by unauthorized person and how 2nd Party was punished by the person who had no authority? Another citation is also on the same point, published in 2001 II CLR page 29 (Electronics Corporation of India vs G. Murlidhar). Citation published in 2001 II CLR page 191 (C.V. George vs Union of India & Ors.) referred by the 2nd Party Advocate which is on the point of Standing Orders and Certified Standing Orders. Citation published in 2006 III CLR page 387 (Manager, Public and Industrial Relations, Nuclear Power Corporation vs P. Chinnasamy & Anr.) is on the point of subject matter of the Standing Orders and Certified Standing Order describing that, if particular act is not covered in particular Standing Orders, then said charge cannot be leveled against and concerned Workman and one cannot ask to explain action on it. Though these are the law points it is not pointed out in what way these can be made applicable to the concerned Workman in the enquiry and how the benefit of it can be given to the concerned Workman at this stage?

12. The entire enquiry proceedings are filed by the 2nd Party itself at Exhibit 9 which reveals that, 4 witnesses are examined by the 1st Party. Those witnesses were made available for cross and cross was taken of those by the Advocate of the concerned Workman who represented. It is not pointed out how, opportunity was not given by pointing out any instance from the enquiry proceedings and to conclude how Enquiry Officer was bias.

13. If we consider all this scenario of the enquiry, the decision taken by the Enquiry Officer and the finding given, I am of the view that, from this general statement, I find it difficult to accept that, enquiry was not fair and proper and finding perverse. Even the case laws referred by the 2nd Party are not touching to the facts of the case and inviting

me to make applicable to the case of the concerned Workman.

14. In this situation and in the circumstances discussed above, I conclude that, enquiry is fair and proper and finding not perverse.

15. So I answer above Issues to that effect and passes the following order :

#### **ORDER**

- (i) Enquiry is fair and proper;
- (ii) Finding not perverse;
- (iii) Parties to participate in the Reference on the point of quantum of punishment.

A. A. LAD, Presiding Officer  
Mumbai 13th August, 2007.

नई दिल्ली, 16 जनवरी, 2008

का. आ. 267.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार भारत पेट्रोलियम कॉर्पोरेशन लिमिटेड के प्रबंधन के संबंध में नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारियों के बीच, अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण/श्रम न्यायालय सं. 2, मुम्बई के पंचाट (संदर्भ संख्या सीजीआईटी-2/77/2001) को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 16-1-08 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं. एल.-30012/14/2001-आई आर (एम)]  
एन. एस. बोरा, डेस्क अधिकारी

New Delhi, the 16th January, 2008

S. O. 267.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the award (Ref. No. CGIT-2/77/2001) of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal/Labour Court No. 2, Mumbai now as shown in the Annexure in the Industrial Dispute between the employers in relation to the management of Bharat Petroleum Corp. Ltd. and their workman, which was received by the Central Government on 16-1-08.

[No. L-30012/14/2001-IR(M)]  
N. S. BORA, Desk Officer

#### **ANNEXURE**

#### **BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL NO. 2, AT MUMBAI**

#### **PRESENT**

**A. A. LAD PRESIDING OFFICER**  
**REFERENCE NO. CGIT-2/77 of 2001**

Employers in relation to the Management of  
Bharat Petroleum Corporation Ltd.

The General Manager  
Bharat Petroleum Corp. Ltd.  
Mahul Refinery, Mumbai 400 074  
And



**Their Workmen**

Shri Ramasray R. Passi  
Narshipada Raman Mali Chawl  
Room No. 1, Akurli Road  
Kandivil (E)  
Mumbai 400 101

**APPEARANCE**

For the employer : Mr. R. S. Pai, Advocate  
For the workman : Mr. Jaiprakash Sawant,  
Advocate

Date of reserving Award : 1st March 2007  
Date of passing of Award : 7th August, 2007

**AWARD- PART I**

The matrix of the facts as culled out from the proceedings are as under:

2. The Government of India, Ministry of Labour by its Order No.30012/14/2001-IR (M) dated 25th May, 2001 in exercise of the powers conferred by clause (d) of sub-section (1) and sub-section 2 (A) of Section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 have referred the following dispute to this Tribunal for adjudication:

“ Whether the action of the Management of Bharat Petroleum Corp.Ltd. Western Region, Mumbai in terminating the services of Shri Ramasray Passi w.e.f. 15-2-2000 is legal and justified? If not, to what relief Shri Ramasray Passi is entitled?”

2. To support the subject-matter involved in the reference 2nd Party workman filed the Statement of Claim at Exhibit 7 stating and contending that, he was employed by 1st Party with effect from 2nd October, 1978 in the capacity as General Workman. 2nd Party workman took housing loan in the year 1987 for building a house at his native place. However, his application was not proceed by the Management in time in spite of repeated requests. So he was awaiting for sanction and during the said period the cost of the construction reached at top. So pending finalization of his loan for building the house at his native place, 2nd Party workmen obtained the housing loan for purchase of a flat at Bhayandar, Mumbai and paid Rs.5000/- to the builder as an advance. First installment was sanctioned by the 1st Party, of Rs.2,60,960/- on 20-4-1994. when the said construction was going, on he found, it was not satisfactory and he realise that he was cheated by the builder, so instead of using the said amount on the construction, he utilized the same for construction of his house at native place. He submitted all concerned documents with estimates and cost of it. According to 2nd Party Workman, he utilize loan at native place Instead of utilizing the loan on flat at Bahayendar, Mumbai, in a good faith and without any intention to cheat the management. He utilized the loan for house purpose only as it was granted as a house loan. Infact It should not be questioned as to

why he utilized the said amount for construction of house at native place? However, 1st Party took it otherwise. Charge sheet of cheating to the Management was leveled against him alleging that, instead of utilizing the money for the purchase of a flat at Bhayendar, Mumbai, he utilized it wrongly for construction of a house at native place. Even disciplinary action was taken by the Corporation. In fact intention behind using the loan and sanctioning it was not considered by the 1st Party. The enquiry which was made was farce. The Enquiry Officer was bias. Full opportunity was not given to the 2nd Party Workman. The punishment awarded of the dismissal was harsh and perverse. So it is submitted that, all that be set aside with directions to the 1st Party to take him in the employment.

3. This claim of the 2nd Party Workman is disputed by the 1st Party by filing reply at Exhibit 9 stating that, the charge sheet dated 22-4-1997 was issued to the, concerned Workman and the domestic enquiry was conducted against him. Admittedly the 2nd Party Workman obtained housing loan to purchase a flat at Bhayendar, Mumbai. Admittedly he utilized the said amount to construct a house at native place. Actually he admitted the same. Full opportunity was given to him. The enquiry officer on the basis of the evidence lead before him observed the 2nd Party Workman guilty of the charge of misconduct and of cheating. Findings are on the basis of evidence punishment is just and proper. So it is submitted that, the Reference be rejected.

4. In view of the above pleadings my Ld. Predecessor framed the Issues at Exhibit 11. Out of them the Issues No. 1 and 2 are treated as preliminary Issues which I answer as follows:

Issue	Findings
1. Whether the domestic enquiry conducted against the workman was as per the principles of natural justice?	Yes
2. Whether the findings of the Inquiry Officer are perverse?	No

**REASONS:****ISSUES NO. 1 & 2:**

5. This is a simple case of enquiry into the charge leveled by issuing charge sheet on the 2nd Party Workman about misappropriation of the house loan taken by him. Admittedly house loan was taken by the 2nd Party and admittedly it was utilized by him at native place instead of utilizing it for purchase of a flat at Bhayander, Mumbai. Charge sheet was served to which 2nd Party replied. In that, context the 2nd Party in the cross, taken at Exhibit 13, admit that, he confessed before Enquiry Officer that, though he availed house loan for purchase of a flat at Bhayander, Mumbai, he utilized it for renovation of his house at his native place. He admits that he signed every enquiry proceedings along with his defence representative. He

admits that neither he nor his representative complained about the Enquiry Officer. He admits that he received report of the Enquiry Officer and admits that, he replied to it. He admits that, house loan was sanctioned to him in 1987 for purchasing a flat at Bhayandar, Mumbai. Then 2nd Party closed evidence by filing pursis at Exhibit 14 whereas 1st Party filed it at Exhibit 17. The 1st Party examined one of its officer by filing an affidavit at Exhibit 16 in lieu of examination-in-chief and in the cross it is stated that, there were no other complaints except this, against the 2nd Party Workman.

6. In the evidence and in the Statement of Claim no specific case is made out by the 2nd Party Workman as to how it can be observed that, the enquiry was not fair and proper and finding not perverse. It is not shown by quoting any example how Enquiry Officer was bias and enquiry should be treated not conducted by following proper procedure and principles of natural Justice? Admittedly house loan was taken which is admitted, fact and is admitted by the 2nd Party Workman. It is also admitted that, he utilized said amount for renovation of his house at native place. He also admits that, the said housing loan was granted to him by the 1st party to purchase a flat at Bhayander, Mumbai. Even he confessed it before the Enquiry Officer. When it is confession and when said charge leveled against workman is of misappropriation of loan at wrong place is admitted question arises how enquiry can be held not as per the principles of natural justice and how finding can be observed perverse? In my considered view it is not pointed out how this Issue can be answered in favour of the 2nd Party Workman? So considering all this I conclude that, the enquiry is fair and proper, finding not perverse. Hence I answer these issues to that effect and passes the following order:

#### ORDER

- (a) Enquiry is fair and proper;
- (b) Finding not perverse,
- (c) Both the parties to appear in this Reference on the point of quantum of punishment.

Mumbai,  
7th August, 2007

A. A. LAD, Presiding Officer

नई दिल्ली, 16 जनवरी, 2008

का. आ. 268.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार स्टेट बैंक आफ इंडिया के प्रबंधन के संबद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच, अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में श्रम न्यायालय अहमदनगर के पंचाट (संदर्भ संख्या 26/2001) को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 16-1-08 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं. एल.-12025/01/2008-आई. आर. (बी. 1)]

अजय कुमार, डेस्क अधिकारी

New Delhi, the 16th January, 2008

S. O. 268.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the award (Ref. No. 26/2001) of Labour Court Ahmednagar as shown in the Annexure, in the industrial dispute between the management of State Bank of India, and their workmen, received by the Central Government on 16-1-08.

[No. L-12025/01/2008-IR(B-1)]

AJAY KUMAR, Desk Officer

#### ANNEXURE

BEFORE SHRI A.A. KHAN, PRESIDING OFFICER,  
1ST LABOUR COURT AT AHMEDNAGAR

Ref. IDA/No. 26/2001

ADJUDICATION

Between

The Assistant General Manager,  
State Bank of India,  
Gulmohar East Street,

Pune (Maharashtra)-411 001 Part No. 1

And

Yeshwant Rangnath Fund,

At Post Parner,

District-Ahmednagar. Party No. 2

Coram Shri A.A. Khan, P.O.

Appearances Shri Chagede, Adv. For  
Party No. 1

Shri Modgekar, Adv. For Party No. 2.

#### AWARD

(Delivered on 20-11-2007)

1. This is a reference us/10(i)(c) read with Sec. 12(5) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 sent by the Central Government for adjudication of claim of the employee to this Court vide Order dated 13-3-2001 of Ministry of Labour, New Delhi.

2. After receipt of Reference, notices were issued to Party No. 1/Employer and Party No. 2/Employee respectively. The party No. 2 has filed his statement of claim at Exh. U-2 and contended that he was initially appointed as a Part-time Sweeper-cum-Watchman in the year 1987. Since then, he is in continuous service. His service record is clean and blotless. The Party No. 1/ employer has also gave sometime full-time job as a Sweeper-cum-Peon. The party No. 2 has completed more than 240 days of service. The Party No. 1 has issued advertisement and called application from the part time employee for filling up the permanent post. The party No. 2 had also applied but the Party No. 1 has not considered his application. The Party No. 1 appointed 27 Watchman-cum-Sweeper as a

permanent employee. The Party No. 2 has completed more than 240 days of service. The Party No. 1 has not issued any notice, nor paid retrenchment compensation and not complied the mandatory provisions of Sec. 25-F of the I.D. Act, 1947. Hence he challenged the oral termination order dated 28-9-96 and requested to reinstate him in service on previous post along-with continuity of service and back wagers.

3. The party No. 1 has filed written statement at Exh. C-7 and contended that the claim of the Party No. 2 is not legal and tenable according to the provisions of law, hence liable to be dismissed. Present case is fall within the meaning of Sec. 2(oo)(bb) of the I.D. Act, 1947 hence it is not a case of retrenchment. On this count also, the complaint is liable to be dismissed. The Party No. 2 was working as a temporary casual labour at Parner branch on the scale offered time to time for the period from 1993 to 1996. He was selected in a messenger cadre, his name was at Srl. No. 4 in the year 1992 list but he could not absorb in the permanent capacity as the list was expired on 31-3-97. In view this factual position, his claim is not tenable. The Party no. 1 further submits that dispute do not fall U/s. 2(a) of the I.D. Act for the reasons as the Party No. 2 has not been retrenched or dismissed him because he was temporary employee. He was called for work time to time in exigency and availability of the work. He never completed 240 days of service, therefore, as per Sec. 25-B of the Act, it is not necessary to follow the procedure before terminating his services and further contended that as per Chapter-IVB not applicable to the present facts.

4. He further contended that as per agreement between the Federation of State Bank of India Employees Union and Management, it was decided to regularize the casual/daily wagers by calling their application by procedure and issuing call by preparing selection list. The selection list was prepared in the year 1996 but thereafter it was lapsed on 31-3-97. The settlement between the Union and employer is binding upon all employees U/s. 2(b) r/w Rule-81 of the I.D. Act. He can not claim permanency and back door entry for getting the services. As per Clause-10 of the Settlement dated 17-11-87, it was settled that there will not be temporary appointment in the sub-ordinate cadre. In such circumstances, the reinstatement of such workers would be violation of settlement between the bank and employees union and also against law of bank. The bank has appointed Sweeper-cum-waterman after adopting due process of law as per recruitment rules in the year 1991. Therefore, his allegations to say that junior employees were appointed in place of senior employee is not correct. He never completed 240 days of service. His services was purely temporary, casual, therefore, his application is not tenable and liable to be dismissed.

5. My Predecessor has framed the issues at Exh. O-8. I recasted it and record my findings thereon for the reasons stated below :

#### Issues Findings

1. Does the party No. 2 proved that his services has been terminated illegally without following due process of law by the Party No. 1? Yes

2. If yes, whether the Party No. 2 further proves that he is entitled for reinstatement with continuity of service and back wagers? Yes, as per Award.

3. What order? As per final Award.

#### REASON

6. As to issue No. 1 : This is a reference U/s. 10(1)(c) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 referred by the Government of India, Ministry of Labour, Delhi for adjudication of the claim of employee and employer. On receipt of Reference, notices were issued to the employer and employee. The employee appeared and filed his Statement of Claim at Exh. U-2. Here-in-after the employee is referred as Party No. 2. The employer has filed his written statement at Exh. C-7. Here-in-after referred as Party No. 1.

7. It is the case of Party No. 2 that he was working as a Sweeper-cum-waterman since 1987. He is in continuous service till the date of termination i.e. 28-9-96. In order to establish the claim of the Party No. 2, the Party No. 2. examined himself at Exh. U-9 and filed documents below Exh. U-7. As against this, the Party No. 1 examined his officer at Exh. C-32 and produced the documents below Exh. C-18. The Party No. 2 employee deposed that he was appointed as a part time Sweeper-cum-watchman in the month of March-87. Thereafter, the party No. 1 also appointed him as a full-time Peon. He produced the copy of muster for the period from 17-3-87 to 19-11-91 at Exh. U/7/1. He also produced the copy of payment vouchers, it is at Exh. U/7/10 for the period from 10-3-93 to 28-9-96. In the year 1988, the Party No. 1 issued advertisement for recruitment of regular Peon. He had also applied for the same. Copy is at Exh. U/7/8. Copy of advertisement is at Exh. U/7/3 and application is at Exh. U/7/4. The party No. 1 State Bank of India appointed one Mangal Chandu Gopa, Godwal Balu Yeshwant, Tamboli Shamiuddin Kasam, A.Y. Gondai, Sanjay Rajaram Bhosale, Chawhan Sanjay Motawale, Gaikwad Somnath Lahanu, Gore Shivaji Dattatraya, Gawhale Bhagwat Sitaram, Kadali Sakharam Kisan, Gite Sakharam Kisan, Ranmal S.R. Dusane Pradeep Somnath and Khandare R.S. But deliberately avoided to give him appointment on the said post. The Party No. 1 had also issued him experience certificate, it is at Exh. C/7/12. They have also issued call letters, it is at Exh. U/7/9. The Party No. 1 has appointed junior employee even after termination of his service. He produced documents below Exh. U/7/13. He had also applied for permanency. The application is at Exh. U/7/14. The Party No. 1 refused to grant him permanency. Letter is at Exh. U/7/15 and U/7/16. According to him, he had completed more than 240 days of service. The Party No. 1 did not issue notice, nor paid retrenchment compensation before terminating his service.

According to him, after termination, he tried to obtain the job. He produced documentary evidence, it is at Exh. U/7/20 to 21.

8. As against this, the Party No. 1 has examined Bank Officer Mr. Vilas Kulkarni by way of filing affidavit at Exh. C-32. He states that the Party No. 2 has worked at Parner branch in casual and temporary capacity intermittently on the scale application time to time. He produced the attendance-sheet, it is at Exh. C-13. The Party No. 2 has never worked for 240 days in any calendar year. He further states that the bank has legal recruitment cell and rules of recruitment cell are binding upon the bank. He was selected in Class-IV category. His name was at srl. no. 4 in the year 1992 list but the said list is expired on 31-3-97. As per settlement between the bank and Employees Union Federation, No candidate from the waiting list of 1992 was absorbed in the bank as earlier waiting list of 1989 was not exhausted the party No. 2 worked temporarily as a messenger-cum-watchman as per exigency of work. He was not in continuous service. He further states that negotiations were conducted between the bank and its Employees Union Federation dated 17-11-87. The settlement was binding on the employee wherein it was agreed that temporary and casual employee would be given one time opportunity to absorb under certain norms. It was agreed that the selection list will keep alive up to 31-3-97. Thereafter, list would be lapsed. It was specifically agreed vide Clause-12 of the Settlement dated 17-11-87 that all the disputes raised by any person shall be deemed to have been settled by virtue of settlement and temporary employee, daily-wager, casual etc. shall not entitled further chance for giving permanent appointment. The Party No. 2 was selected and thereafter the list was scribed. Therefore, as per terms and settlement, the Party No. 2 has stopped from raising any dispute. The present Reference is not maintainable, hence liable to be dismissed. The counsel for Party No. 2. cross-examined him at the length.

9. Heard Shri Modgekar, Adv. For the Party No. 2. He argued that Settlement dated 17-11-87 is not binding on the Party No. 2 because he was not the party. The agreement can not prevail the mandatory provision of Sec. 25-F. According to him, the Party No. 2 has completed more than 240 days of service. He further argued that he had filed notice to produce the document Exh. U-3 and call the muster, pay-voucher, seniority list, list of new employee and service book. In spite of directions, the Party No. 1 failed to produce all the documents. Therefore, adverse inference be drawn against the Party No. 1. He has produced muster and vouchers bills below Exh. U-7 itself shows that the Party No. 2 was appointed some part-time and sometime full-time and he has completed 240 days of service. The Party No. 1 appointed the junior employee. He produced the documents below Exh. U-23 and U-7. He relied on (1) (2) 2000(87) FLR 750, 2001 I CLR 570, (3) 2002 LLR 1195, (4) 1999 LLR 460, (5) 1988 I CLR 38 (6) S.C. Labour judgment

601, (7) 1991 II CLR 726, (8) 1991 I CLR 1068, (9) 2006 I CLR 931, (10) 2005 (2) Bom. L.C. 636, (11) 2006 (111) FLR 919, (12) 2006 II CLR 789, (13) 2007 (114) FLR 928, (14) Supreme Court Labour judgment p. 601. 2001 (88) FLR 508, (15) 2001 Lab. I.C. 2127 and (16) 2007 I CLR 1056.

10. As against this, Shri Changede, Adv. For the Party No. 1 argued that the Party No. 2 failed to raise the dispute in reasonable time, therefore, as per law laid down in the case reported in 1993 L.I.C. 802 Bom. H.C., the dispute is not raised within reasonable time, hence liable to be rejected. Secondly, he argued that Employees Union Federation and Bank has entered into the Settlement dated 17-11-87. It was agreed between the employees Federation and Bank that daily rated employee/casual employee shall not be entitled for any further chance being considered for permanent appointment and said Settlement is binding U/s 2(p) and 18(1) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947. Therefore, the claim is not tenable. Further he invited my attention on the documents of Party No. 2 filed below Exh. U/7/7. The documents itself shows that from 1987 to 1991 to worked about 236 days on pay-scale. It shows that in the year 1993, he worked for 61 days. In the year 1994 he worked for 256 days, in the year 1995 he worked for 238 days and in the year 1993 he worked for 144 days. He never completed 240 days of service, hence provisions of Sec. 25-F of the I.D. Act is not applicable. Further argued that the Party no. 1 used to engage him as per exigency of work and he was appointed for particular period. Therefore, as per Sec. 2(o)(bb) of the I.D. Act, no question of following the mandatory provisions of Sec. 25-F of the said Act is arise. He further argued that he was not in continuous service. As per Sec. 25-B of the said Act, the services of part time worker can not be deemed to be a continuous service for counting 240 days of service. As per recent case law reported in Secretary of State of Karnataka v Umadevi reported in 2006 II CLR 261, the Party No. 1 is statutory Body of Central Government and held that long service of ad-hoc employee did not acquire any right to permanent appointment. He also relied on 1993 L.I.C. 802 Bom. H.C. (2) 2006 II CLR 261, (II) 1992 II LLJ SC 452, (4) AIR 1997 SC 3091, (5) AIR 1997 3657, (6) 1988 L.I.C. 867 (7) AIR 1981 SC 1253 (8) 1988 L.I.C. 1125 RAJ.H.C., (9) 1995 L.I.C. 2012 RAJ H.C., (10) 1995 CLR 781 SC and (11) 2006 (109) FLR 237 and (12) 2007 LLR 1071.

11. I have gone through the statement of claim, written statement, evidence and documents on record in the light of points argued by the counsel for the Party No. 1 and Party No. 2. I have also gone through the rulings cited by both parties. From the pleadings of parties first of all, I have to see, whether the Party No. 2 prove that he had completed 240 days of service within the meaning of Sec. 25-B of the I.D. Act. The Party No. 1 raised legal objection that the dispute falls U/s 2(o)(bb) of the I.D. Act and demand raised by the Party No. 2 is beyond the period of reasonable limitation. The second objection is raised by

the Party no. 1 is that so called settlement between employees Federation and Bank is not binding u/s 2(p) and Sec. 18 of the I.D. Act. Therefore, claim is not tenable.

12. First of all, I would like to decide the legal objections raised by the Party No. 1. in this regard, I must refer Sec. 25-B of the I.D. Act which speaks that for the purpose of deciding the continuous service, a workman shall be said to be in continuous service for period if he is, for that period, in uninterrupted service, including service which may be uninterrupted on account of sickness or authorise leave or an accident or a strike which is not illegal, or a lockout or a cessation of work which is not due to any fault on the part of a workman. Further speaks that where a workman is in continuous service within the meaning of Clause (1), for a period of one year or 6 months, he shall be deemed to be in continuous service; (a) for a period of one year if workman, during a period of 12 calendar months preceding the date with reference to which calculation is to be made, has actually worked under the employer for not less than 190 days in case of workman employed below ground in a mine; and 240 days in other cases. I have carefully scrutinize the oral, as well as, documentary evidence on record adduced by both parties. Document, Exh. U-7/10 is the copy of muster roll and voucher for the period from 10-3-93 to 28-9-96 and it appears that he was in continuous service. I have also gone through the certificate issued by the Party no. 1. dated 17-6-88 at Srl. No 2 below Exh. U-7. It appears that in the year 1975 to 1976 he worked for 35 days. Another certificate issued dated 30-8-96 by Branch Manager, State Bank of India, Parner wherein it is contended that in the year 1993, he worked for 61 days, in 1994 he worked for 256 days, in the year 1995 he worked for 238 days and in the year 1996 he worked for 144 days. It is noted that though the Party no. 1 contended in his written statement and evidence that the party No. 2 has not completed 240 days of service in any calendar year from 1993 to 1996 but the Party No. 1 did not deny the contents of experience certificate issued by their officer dated 30-8-96 filed below Exh. U/7/12. It is argued by Shri Changede, Adv. that the Party No. 2 was appointed on 1/2 and 3/4 time scale. He was appointed full time scale for 14 days in the year 1993 for 104 days in 1994, 67 days in the year 1995 and 84 days in the year 1996. Therefore, his services can not be counted as continuous service within the meaning of Sec. 25-B of the I. D. Act. I have gone through the ruling cited by the Party No. 2. **Deep Chandra v. State of U.P. reported in 2000 (88) FLR 508** wherein it is held that the workman put in more than 240 days of service in each year from 1982 to 1988, he has been retrenched without following the provisions of Sec. 25-F of the I.D. Act. I have also gone through the Judgment of our High Court, **General Manager v. Naresh Brijlal Charote reported in 2001 Lab. I.C. 2127** wherein the Judgment of Hon'ble Supreme Court cited by the Party No. 1 i.e. **AIR 1981 SC 1253** was discussed and our High Court held

that U/s 2(s) and 25-F, the definition of workman does not make any distinction between the part-time employee and full-time employee. The respondent appointed as part-time Sweeper and required to do manual and skilled work, he is a workman u/s 2(s) of the said Act. The compliance of mandatory provision of Sec. 25-F of the said Act before terminating his services is essential. Therefore, held that the order of termination is void ab initio. It is also held by Hon'ble Rajasthan High Court in **State of Rajasthan v. Lal Bahadur Yadav reported in 2002 (3) L.L.N. 1205** and also held by Delhi High Court in **Coal India v. Presiding Officer, Labour Court reported in Coal India Ltd. P.L. (Labour Court-3) 2001 II CLR 502**, held that part-time employee is also covered by definition of a workman contained in Sec. 2(s) of the said Act. Therefore, the objection raised by the counsel for Party No. 1 is not acceptable to say that the Party No. 2 was part-time employee, hence does not cover by definition of a workman u/s 2(s) of the I.D. Act.

13. The Party No. 1 further raised objection that even if it is considered that the part-time employee is covered by definition of workman contained in Sec. 2(s) of the I.D. Act, even though the complainant is daily rated employee, he was appointed for particular period and he falls u/s 2 (oo) (bb) of the I.D. Act. I have discussed above that the Party No. 1 has issued experience certificate in favour of the Party No. 2 dated 30-8-96 filed below Exh. U/7/12 wherein it is clearly mentioned in that in the year January-1994 to December-1994, he has completed 256 days of service. In view of settled position of law discussed in Hon'ble Supreme Court's Judgment reported in **Supreme Court Labour Judgment 1984—87 p. 601 Civil Appeal No. 6417/NL/1983 decided on 10-9-85 between H.D. Singh v. R.B.I.** wherein it is held that the word 'for any reason for whatever' occurring in Sec. 2 (oo) are very wide and almost admitting of no exception. But striking of the name of workman from the rolls by the employer amounts to 'termination of service' and such termination is retrenchment within the meaning of Sec. 2 (oo) of I.D. Act and therefore there is violation of mandatory provision of Sec. 25-F of I.D. Act. Further in para-3 of the Judgment, it is observed that in absence of any evidence to the contrary, court must draw inference that the workman has completed more than 240 days of service.

14. I have also gone through the recent Judgment of our Bombay High Court reported in **2006 I CLR 931. 2005 (2) Bom. L.C. 636 and 2006 II CLR 789 Guj. H.C.** The Hon'ble High Court have held that even a daily rated or casual workman who have completed more than 240 days of service, termination from the service, the compliance of Sec. 25-F of the I.D. Act is mandatory and it is held that the termination is illegal. Here in this case, the Party No. 2 has established that in the year January-1994 to December-1994 he has completed 256 days of service. The document filed below Exh. U/7/12 which is not disputed by the Party No. 1. Hence I hold that it does not fall under the exception

of Sec. 2(oo)(bb) of the Act, hence the compliance of Sec. 25-F of the said Act before terminating the service is necessary.

15. It is further argued by Shri Changede, Adv. that the Party No. 2 has not raised his dispute within reasonable time; and therefore, Reference is deserves to be dismissed. He relied on the Judgment of our Bombay High Court reported in 1993 Lab. I.C. 802 Bom. H.C. I have gone through the Supreme Court's Judgment reported in 1999 1 CLR 1068 cited by the counsel for the Party No. 2 wherein it is held that the limitation is not made applicable to the I.D. Act. In view of the settled position of law laid down by the Supreme Court, the argument advanced by the counsel for the Party No. 1 to say that the dispute is raised beyond the period of limitation is not acceptable.

16. It is further argued by Shri Changede, Adv. that as per Sec. 18 (1) of the I.D. Act, the Settlement arrived between the employer and workman shall be binding on the parties to the agreement. I have gone through the copies of Settlements dated 17-11-87, 16-7-88, 27-10-88, 9-1-91 and 10-7-96 filed below Exh. C-18. It was between the State Bank of India and Representative of workman President of India, State Bank of India Staff Federation. It was agreed between the Union and S.B.I. that temporary employee and casual labour would be given one time opportunity to be absorbed under certain norms, for that purpose, panel would be prepared for filling up the vacancies as per norms agreed and panel for absorption would be kept alive up to 31-3-97 under the Settlement. It was also agreed that temporary employee, daily wagger, casual etc. shall not be entitled for any further chance for being considered for permanent appointment. Further agreed that there will be no temporary appointment in subordinate cadre and temporary appointed should be stopped. It is noted that nowhere it is settled and agreed that all part-time employee should be dismiss, discharge, remove, retrench, terminate from the service. Sec. 18 proviso clearly speaks that all the agreement are binding except in respect of dismissal, removal, termination of service or suspension of employee. It is not disputed that the Settlement between State Bank of India and S.B.I. Federation filed below Exh. C-18 are binding but I have discussed above that nowhere it is stated and agreed that the part-time employee who are working should be retrenched or removed from the service. Here, in this case, the State Bank of India himself acted contrary to the Settlement and removed him from services. Not only this but also violated the mandatory provisions of Sec. 25-F of the I.D. Act. No one months notice nor retrenchment compensation paid to the Party No. 2 before terminating his service. I have also gone through the other Judgment cited by the counsel for Party No. 1. The facts and circumstances of the cited cases are not similar with the facts in hand. Hence, I hold that the termination is illegal and answer Issue No. 1 in affirmative.

17. **As to Issue No. 2 and 3 :** In view of the findings given on Issue No. 1, the Party No. 1 is entitled for the relief of reinstatement with continuity in service. Now, the question remains above the back wages. The Party No. 2 states that after termination in the year 1999, he applied for the post of Peon in District Court, Ahmednagar and in Ahmednagar Education Society for the post of Peon. He produced the call letters at Exh. U/7/20 and U/7/21 but he could not obtain the job. I have persued the call letters filed below Exh. U/7/20 and 21. It appears that he applied for permanent post. Admittedly, the Party No. 2 was working as a Sweeper-cum-waterman on daily wage basis. Record appears that he was terminated from service from 28-9-96 and he raised the dispute in the year 2001 by filing an application dated 15-10-2001 before the Ministry of Labour, New Delhi. The dispute was raised after 6 years of termination. Admittedly, there is no limitation for filing the dispute under the I.D. Act. It is also well settled law that in case of reinstatement, granting of back wages is normal rule but while granting or refusing, we must see, whether the workman approached to the authority within reasonable time or not. During evidence, the Party No. 2 did not state, why he late to approach to Apporopriate Authority. Admittedly, he was daily rated worker. In this respect, I must refer the recent ruling M.P. Textbook Corporation v. S.K. Parasar reported in 2005 II CLR 240 and Devraj Chandrabali Rai v. National Textile Corporation Reported in 2005 ICLR 61 Bom. H.C. wherein it is held that, 'when the dispute as to termination raised after about 8 years of termination, employer can not be fastened with back wages'. In this back ground, in view of guidelines given by the Hon'ble High Court, I also declined the back wages while awarding the reinstatement. Hence, I answer Issue No. 2 partly in affirmative; and proceed to pass the following award :

#### AWARD

1. The reference is hereby answered partly in affirmative.
2. The Party No. 1 is directed to reinstate the Party No. 2 with continuity of service from the date of termination on his previous post, i.e. Part-time Sweeper but without back wages.
3. Four copies of Award be sent to Government of India Ministry of Labour, New Delhi for favour of information and necessary action.

A. A. KHAN, Presiding Officer

Ahmednagar

Dt. 20-11-2007

नई दिल्ली, 17 जनवरी, 2008

का. आ. 269.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार इन्दौर-उज्जैन क्षेत्रीय ग्रामीण बैंक के प्रबंधन के संबद्ध नियोजकों और उनके

कर्मचारों के बीच, अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण, जबलपुर के पंचाट (संदर्भ संख्या 32/1994) को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 17-1-08 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं. एल.- 12012/267/1993-आई आर (बी.-1)]

अजय कुमार, डेस्क अधिकारी

New Delhi, the 17th January, 2008

S. O. 269.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the award (Ref. No. 32/1994) of Central Government Industrial Tribunal-cum-Labour Court, Jabalpur as shown in the Annexure, in the industrial dispute between the management of Indore Ujjain Kshetriya Gramin Bank, and their workman, received by the Central Government on 16-1-08.

[No.L- 12012/267/1993-IR(B-I)]

AJAY KUMAR, Desk Officer

#### ANNEXURE

#### BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL-CUM-LABOUR COURT, JABALPUR

No. CGIT/LC/R/32/94

Presiding Officer: SHRI C. M. SINGH

Shri Bholaram, S/o Puraji,  
Village Kanardi,

Th. Tarana, Distt. Ujjain (MP) ...Workman/Union

*Versus*

The President,  
Indore Ujjain Kshetriya Gramin Bank,  
Head Office: 01, Dussehra Maidan,  
Ujjain (MP)

....Management

#### AWARD

Passed on this 14th day of December, 2007

1. The Government of India, Ministry of Labour vide its Notification No.L-12012/267/93-IR(B-I) dated 28-3-94 has referred the following dispute for adjudication by this tribunal :

“Whether the action of the management of Indore Ujjain Kshetriya Gramin Bank, Ujjain in terminating the services of Shri Bholaram S/o. Puraji, Casual messenger, Kanardi branch, w.e.f. 24-7-90 is legal and justified? If not, to what relief the workman is entitled?”

2. The case of workman in brief is as follows. That he was appointed as part time messenger at Indore Ujjain Kshetriya Gramin Bank, branch Kanardi on 1-4-87. The branch has invited application from all such part time messengers for regularisation of their services according to circular No. 89-90/10 Karmik/दिअ/6/26 dated 15-11-89. In the said application, the workman has mentioned that he has been working in Bank for past 2½ years. But the Bank management did not regularise the services of workman.

Therefore, after completing 240 days of work, the workman moved to Central Labour Enforcement Officer for regularisation of Civil Services wherein the management declined the reconciliation. It is prayed by the workman that he may be given justice.

3. The case of management in brief is as follows. That there is no provision of regularisation of part time messenger. They are employed as casual labours. It has been pleaded that applicant Bholaram was never employed with the management. When needed, he was used to be employed as daily wager. His integrity was doubtful. Therefore the Bank stopped to employ him. The reference is, therefore, liable to be dismissed.

4. Applicant Bholaram moved an application for closing the reference mentioning therein that he does not want to prosecute the reference. On this application, the reference was closed for passing no dispute award vide order dated 6-12-2007 of this tribunal.

5. It is very clear from the above that now no industrial dispute is left between the parties. Therefore, no dispute award is passed without any orders as to costs.

6. Let the copies of the award be sent to the Government of India, Ministry of Labour and Employment as per rules.

C. M. SINGH, Presiding Officer

नई दिल्ली, 24 जनवरी, 2008

का. आ. 270.—कर्मचारी भविष्य निधि तथा प्रकीर्ण पबंध अधिनियम, 1952 (1952 का 191 की धारा 5क की उप-धारा (i) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, केन्द्र सरकार एतद्वारा श्री डी. एल. सचदेव को केन्द्रीय न्यासी बोर्ड (कर्मचारी भविष्य निधि) के सदस्य के रूप में नियुक्त करती है तथा दिनांक 26 मई, 2004 की संख्या का.आ. 637(अ) के अंतर्गत भारत के राजपत्र में प्रकाशित इस मंत्रालय की अधिसूचना में निम्नलिखित संशोधन करती है :

2. उक्त अधिसूचना में “धारा 5-क की उप-धारा (1) के खण्ड (घ) के अंतर्गत कर्मचारियों के प्रतिनिधि” शीर्षक के अंतर्गत क्रम संख्या 42 पर की गई प्रविष्टि श्री प्रद्युम्न सिंह के स्थान पर निम्नलिखित प्रविष्टि प्रतिस्थापित की जाएगी, अर्थात् :

श्री डी.एल. सचदेव,  
सचिव, अखिल भारतीय श्रमिक संघ कांग्रेस,  
35-36, डी. डी. यू. मार्ग,  
नई दिल्ली-110002

[फा. सं. वी-20012/2/2003-एस एस-II]

एस. डी. जेवियर, अवर सचिव

New Delhi, the 24th January, 2008

S. O. 270.—In exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (i) of Section 5A of the Employees' Provident Funds and Miscellaneous Provisions Act, 1952 (19 of 1952), the Central Government hereby appoints Shri D.L. Sachdev

as a member of the Central Board of Trustees (Employees' Provident Fund) and makes the following amendment in this Ministry's Notification published in the Gazette of India having No. S.O. 637(E) dated 26th May, 2004 :—

2. In the said Notification under the heading "Representatives of Employees" under clause (d) of sub-section (1) of Section 5-A, for entries against Sl. No. 42

Shri Parduman Singh, the following entry shall be substituted namely :

Shri D.L. Sachdev,  
Secretary, All India Trade Union Congress,  
35-36, DDU Marg, New Delhi 110002.

[F.No. V -20012/2/2003-SS-II]

S. D. XAVIER, Under Secy.